

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 22 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

The

London Quarterly

&

AP Holborn Review

LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY
EDITOR · LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., PH.D.

Contributors Include

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE, M.A.

ALBERT D. BELDEN, D.D.

G. THOMPSON BRAKE

R. LEE COLE, M.A., B.D.

C. A. COULSON, M.A., PH.D., D.SC., F.INST.P., F.R.S.E., F.R.S.

D. R. DAVIES

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN

A. W. HEATHCOTE, PH.D., M.A., M.TH., M.SC.

M. L. V. HUGHES, B.A.

R. ELLIOTT KENDALL

H. G. MEECHAM, M.A., D.D., PH.D.

WALTER C. SMITH

C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

London

THE EPWORTH PRESS

(FRANK H. GUMBERS)

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

APRIL 1953

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments: by Leslie F. Church, B.A., PH.D.	81	The Philosophy of Neighbourliness by M. L. V. Hughes, B.A.	123
Science and Religion by C. A. Coulson, M.A., PH.D., D.S.C., F.INST.P., F.R.S.E., F.R.S.	87	The Basis of the Moral Factor in Education by G. Thompson Brake	130
In Praise of Hospitality by H. G. Meecham, M.A., D.D., PH.D.	94	Broadcasting: An Assessment by Walter C. Smith	136
Jesus as Teacher by A. D. Belden, D.D.	97	Two Studies in Science by A. W. Heathcote, PH.D., M.A., M.TH., M.SC.	140
International Arbitration and Randall Cremer by T. Driffield Hawkin	102	Easter Sunday at Fulneck, 1753 by W. H. G. Armytage, M.A.	144
Report on China by R. Elliott Kendall	106	Wesley's Handwriting by R. Lee Cole, M.A., B.D.	145
The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 by T. Francis Glasson	112	Recent Literature Edited by Harold Mallinson	148
Communism: The New Islam by D. R. Davies	117	From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., B.D.	156

How to make your money go further

MANY friends of the National Children's Home say 'I should like to give more, but . . .' Do you know that you can almost double the value of your annual subscriptions providing you pay tax on the standard rate? The Finance Acts provide that on gifts made regularly for a charitable purpose Income Tax paid by the subscriber can be refunded to the charity concerned. All you have to do is to sign a simple Deed of Covenant stating that you will give an annual amount for a period of not less than seven years, and sign a certificate which the Home supplies each year. This enables the Home to claim back from the Income Tax Authorities the tax which the subscriber has paid on his subscription plus the tax on that amount.

The following table shows how this covenanted system of giving greatly helps the Home:—

1 guinea	per year for seven years makes a total gift of	£14
2 guineas	per year for seven years makes a total gift of	£28
5 guineas	per year for seven years makes a total gift of	£70
10 guineas	per year for seven years makes a total gift of	£140

Please send a card to the Income Tax Recovery Department, National Children's Home, Highbury Park, London, N.5, who will send you the necessary form to sign before you make your first payment.

THE

I

in

wa

See

so

is a

,

tha

It

the

rou

bel

the

we

in

fea

A g

rea

shi

ass

cer

Gy

Oth

imp

thin

7

and

cro

mo

and

An

cro

wh

As

a s

cro

war

I

his

Aft

gre

Editorial Comments

THE CORONATION—A DAY OF OPPORTUNITY

IT is probable that more people are interesting themselves in the pageantry and ritual of the coming Coronation than has been the case in any similar event in history. In May 1937, when George the Sixth was crowned, the ceremony was broadcast for the first time, but in June 1953, the crowning of Elizabeth the Second will be televised. No other coronation will have been seen or heard by so many people. How far the deeper significance of the occasion will be realized is another matter!

The origin of some of the ritual is lost in the dim past, but the survival of much that was already traditional in pre-Christian Britain has its peculiar significance. It was essential, for example, that the new ruler should be presented, formally, to the people. At the tribal gathering the elders formed a circle which was surrounded by the warriors. The women and children stood on a raised platform behind, whilst the priests invoked the ancient gods. As the ceremony proceeded the king answered the questions asked by all his fighting men, whose fierce voices were raised in unison. A circlet of linen was placed on his head and a great club in his right hand. After he had sworn an Oath that he would lead them without fear or favour, in peace and war, he stood waiting for the climax of the ceremony. A great shield was placed on the ground and the king stepped on it, standing firmly, ready for the *Gyratio*. The elders and chief warriors, holding the rim of the shield, lifted up their crowned king so that all might see him, and the whole assembly roared their approval. So far we can trace the parallel in the modern ceremonial; the war-club in the sceptre, the linen diadem in the crown, the *Gyratio* in the *Inthronization*, and the acclamation in the Act of Recognition. Other details might be cited to show the continuity of ideas, but the supreme importance of the Coronation of Elizabeth the Second will not lie in any of these things.

The pagan ceremony was centred on the presentation of the ruler to the people, and on their approval and acceptance of their sovereign. As soon as the act of crowning a monarch became Christian, the whole focus was changed. The most essential feature was the presentation of the king for the approval of God, and the consecration and dedication of his life to his royal task. The Act of Anointing—or the Anointment as it is sometimes called—had originated with the crowning of Israel's kings, and when it was adopted in Europe, it transformed the whole pagan ceremonial, giving the ruler both spiritual and temporal authority. As Dean Stanley has said: 'The sacred oil was believed to convey to the sovereign a spiritual jurisdiction and inalienable sanctity.' When the son of Offa was crowned King of Mercia in A.D. 796 the Saxon Chronicle stresses the fact that he was 'crowned to King by use of the Holy Oil'.

In A.D. 925 Athelstan, chosen by the Witan, was styled King of the English, and his coronation at Kingston-on-Thames was 'a dreade and marvellous cerymonie'. After he was presented to the people in the market-place, he seated himself on the great stone whilst the crowd acclaimed him. Then carried on a war-shield, held

high above the heads of the warriors, he was borne to the church door. Here Aldhelm, the Archbishop, and two Bishops met him and led him to the altar, where, lying prostrate on the ground, he gave himself to secret prayer.

So, gradually, what has been called the 'Ethelred the Second Ritual' was developed from what, in Britain, had been a pagan ceremony. The Coronation has become a hallowing. In the words of Archbishop Lang, it is 'The solemn recognition of the sacred character of royalty and loyalty'. The essentials have remained the same through a thousand years. In 1307 the *Liber Regalis* was written, setting out the 'Royal Offices to be Performed and Observed According to the Use of the Royal Church of Westminster', and this was the order used, the next year, at the crowning of Edward the Second.

Through the centuries the changes have been few, and always the stress on the sacredness of the trust has increased. At the Coronation of Elizabeth the Second there will be the Act of Recognition, the Oath, the Anointing, the Investiture, the Crowning, the Inthronization, the Homage, and the celebration of Holy Communion. Here and there various 'acts manual', each with its solemn symbolism, have been introduced from time to time. The placing of crown and sword on the altar, and the taking of them back as a trust from God Himself is specially significant. The Archbishop will give the Bible to the Queen and will say: 'Our gracious Queen; we present you with this Book, the most valuable thing that this world affords. Here is wisdom; this is the royal Law; these are the lively oracles of God.'

Such things are not artificial ornaments added to an ancient ritual. They are, we believe, the natural expression of a people's faith. It would be of inestimable benefit to our immediate future if as a nation we approached this historic occasion intelligently and sincerely. Few people would rob it of its pageantry, but it is not meant to be a 'show'. Those who are considering it solely from the standpoint of entertainment value or as a commercial opportunity are guilty, perhaps unconsciously, of sacrilege. The Queen will be remembering what was said of her much-loved grandfather: 'The King comes not alone to his Hallowing. He bears his people with him.' In so far as we look for her act of dedication, in honour bound, we must surely offer ourselves in that service to which, each in his own way, kings and their subjects, fulfil their high destiny.

The day our Queen is crowned might well be a day on which we, too, might take our lives as a sacred trust from Almighty God. The day Elizabeth the Second is consecrated we might become a dedicated people. It *could* be a turning-point in our history.

TWO BIRTHDAYS—AND THEIR CELEBRATION

TWO hundred and fifty years ago, on June 17 (Old Style), Susanna Wesley gave birth to a son. He was called John Benjamin, after two of his brothers who had died in infancy, and was the only child in the family to have two Christian names. The atmosphere in the home at Epworth was calmer than it had been for some time. When William the Third had been left alone on the throne, after the death of his Stuart Queen Mary, Susanna had declared: 'I do not believe the Prince of Orange to be king'. This had caused a sharp difference of opinion between her husband, the rector, and herself. The accession of Queen Anne, a true Stuart,

'restored conjugal harmony'. Indeed, it had brought a more settled mood to the whole country. The new Queen was the last Protestant of her line, and a devout Anglican. She was content to leave the shaping of her foreign policy to her ministers. If she was at times obstinate and prejudiced, she was fortunate in having the same prejudices as the majority of her people. Besides, she was a woman, and the crowd, with native chivalry, liked her. At her coronation, the year before John Wesley was born, she had asserted herself. It was the ancient prerogative of the Lord Great Chamberlain to bring all the clothes to the sovereign on the morning of the ceremony and to perform certain services at the banquet which followed. In return he received various perquisites, including all the furnishings of the royal bedroom and all the sovereign's personal clothes worn that day. In spite of precedents, Queen Anne stoutly refused to comply, and paid the Chamberlain £300, as W. J. Passingham says, 'to keep her "bottom drawer" intact'. Her very femininity made its appeal to the people, and, within a few months, she was firmly established on the throne.

It was soon obvious that she would be a staunch supporter of the Established Church and this was important. The clergy became more confident in a day when sermons had a powerful influence on popular politics. Country parishioners had neither the capacity nor the inclination to read the pamphlets of Addison the Whig or Swift the Tory, and not many saw the monthly news-sheet which had only a limited circulation, especially in the villages.

Before John Wesley reached his second birthday, in 1705, a General Election was fought on the main issue of Occasional Conformity. The Rector of Epworth, with his strong Tory views, was unpopular with his Whig parishioners in the Isle of Axholme, and a mob surrounded the Rectory, firing guns and pistols, and shouting as they saw the children in the garden: 'Ye devils! We'll come and turn ye all out of doors a-begging shortly.' In the house Susanna was mourning her dead babe, which had been overlaid by the nurse, and Samuel was worrying over plans to meet his mounting debts. Two months later he was lodged in the Debtors' Prison in Lincoln Castle where, as he said, he was 'mouldy in a jail, and sunk a thousand fathom below nothing'.

In such a troubled little world, Susanna set herself to teach her children, while her husband began, eagerly, to preach to his fellow-prisoners 'hoping to do more good in this new parish than in the old one'. In this stormy weather the infant 'Jackie' began his little life. Not even Susanna could have dreamed that she was cradling one of the world's greatest evangelists, who would span and help to shape his century.

Two hundred and fifty years after his birth we have become accustomed to celebrate, year by year, that second 'birthday', on 24th May 1738, when he experienced so profound a spiritual change that for him life seemed to begin again.

Since this year marks concerted action by World Methodism to recapture something of its original evangelistic fervour, some people have been discussing which date—28th June or 24th May—should be particularly stressed. It is an unnecessary argument. The President of the Methodist Conference in Great Britain and Ireland, the Rev. Colin A. Roberts, has emphasized the fact that Methodism is not proposing to promote a revival in the generally accepted sense. It is praying and preparing for a quickening of the whole Church, and is exploring every opportunity to go to the 'outsider' with the eternal Gospel, expressed in language

which shall be intelligible to the people of today and applicable to our present problems.

Nothing could be more foolish than to become slaves of clocks and calendars in such matters. The winds of God are not to be commanded and a spiritual meteorological office is more unreliable than any weather prophet. To appoint times and seasons when the Eternal shall break in is ridiculous, if it is not sacrilegious. At the same time, it is surely right that 24th May, the day of Wesley's Evangelical Conversion, and 2nd June, the day of the Coronation, and 28th June (N.S.), the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of John Wesley's birth, should all be occasions for thanksgiving, for self-examination, and, above all, for personal dedication to the task to which God calls us in His own way and His own time.

THE SPHINX BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

FOR most of her history Russia has lived behind an iron curtain, though its thickness has varied from time to time. In so far as those outside have been able to read the meaning of Russian foreign policy through the centuries, it has often appeared contradictory or inconsistent. A strange mixture of idealism and realism has characterized much that at first sight seemed grossly aggressive. If the Russian is intentionally enigmatic to the outer world, his features are never quite like the Sphinx. Inscrutable they may be, but there is never the mysterious, provocative smile of a Mona Lisa, nor the self-confident challenge of that age-old face that lives in the Egyptian stone. Instead, there is a mournful questing, which makes one wonder on occasion whether there is not a fundamental wistfulness behind it all. To say this would be to rouse angry comments from those who think of Russia solely in terms of the men in the Kremlin today, but the soul of the Russian can never be confined to Five Year Plans nor find its full expression in the ideology of Karl Marx.

The Slav peoples are closer knit together than most other groups, and this underlying unity is not dependent on political bonds, but on ties of blood relationship combined with a strange religious mysticism, which seems a million miles away from the Politburo and the immediate happenings in Leningrad and Moscow. One need not be a prophet to say, with confidence, that the soul of the Russian people will survive the fiercest onslaughts of materialism, and come eventually to spiritual freedom.

The formation of the Russian character has been influenced considerably by geographical conditions. Long, deep-flowing rivers, vast steppes, great cathedral-like forests, and widespread marsh-lands have tended to preserve a natural isolation. The Arctic coast and the Siberian wastes were themselves curtain enough for the northern approaches. Until recent times the lack of adequate internal communication has meant that Moscow and St Petersburg were quite unknown to the vast majority of Russian peasants. Even today, the relatively small number of avowed Communists makes one wonder how far the average Russian knows, still less understands, the meaning and purpose of the machine by which he is governed. In so vast a country, with such strange frontiers, it was hardly necessary even to draw the curtain to shut out the rest of the world.

As for her neighbours—Poland, Sweden, and Finland, were for a time powerful and barred the way to the Baltic, which was, from the Russian point of view, the

coveted western outlet. To the south the Cossack Republic and the Tartar Crimea presently ceased to be, but the Ottoman Empire, far-flung in Europe and the Near East, made any Russian advance to the Black Sea a hazardous and unlikely adventure. By the end of the seventeenth century the situation had begun to change, and soon Sweden was broken, Poland was threatened, and Peter the Great was lifting the Iron Curtain to look for some way to attack the Turk. It was then that the long, uneasy partnership between Austria and Russia began. In some ways it was a loveless 'marriage of convenience', whose sole purpose was to overthrow a powerful neighbour and possess his garden!

Even from such a summary survey it is obvious that geographical isolation had shaped Russian history and influenced the national character. Little was known by Western Europe of the language or life of the people, though it is an astonishing fact that the British Navy had relied on the Russians for timber and especially for rope, even in Elizabethan times. As Mildred Wretts-Smith has said: 'The fleet that defeated the Spanish Armada was largely rigged with Russian cordage and cables.' After the creation of the Muscovy Company in 1555, a certain number of Englishmen, merchants and craftsmen, went to Russia, and English doctors were sought by the Court so eagerly that it was extremely difficult for them to get the royal permission to return home. In the time of Peter the Great the first Russian fleet was brought into being by William Gordon, and some of its officers were fellow Scots. Such contacts, however, were too slight either to influence the Russian people as a whole, or to give the people of England any real knowledge of their way of life.

The psychological factor is of still greater importance in considering the modern problem. Any serious consideration of Russian history will reveal an astonishing combination of idealism and self-seeking, of religion and imperialism, 'in which says Professor Seton-Watson, referring to Russian policy to Turkey, 'the perfectly genuine desire to liberate kinsfolk and co-religionists from a hateful yoke is offset by a tendency to regard them as useful tools in the long struggle for the expulsion of the Turks from Europe'. These two characteristics, which seem to us so contradictory, are to be found continually in Russian policy. Even in the present situation this remains true. 'Those who see in the Russia of Stalin nothing but a communist ideology are as wide of the mark as those who think that its reviving materialism is a mere swing-back of the pendulum to a vanished world order. But the foundations of policy remain curiously unchanged.'

When toward the end of the eighteenth century, the power of Turkey and Poland was on the wane, Austria and Russia looked eagerly eastward. The new Power—Prussia—determined to prevent these ill-matched partners from looting Turkey, turned their attention to the west and persuaded them both to join in the tragic partitions of Poland. It is in the Polish contacts of Catherine the Great that one finds an earlier example of modern Communist tactics. The more she was able to encourage anarchy in Poland the better Catherine was able to prosecute her purpose. But even as one looks at this evidence of her infamy, one remembers how careful she was to display her 'loyalty' to the Russian Orthodox Church—not, one imagines, because of her personal convictions, but because she knew that the mass of her subjects were incurably religious!

So, as one tries to look at the present problems against the background of the centuries, one realizes that the seemingly contradictory qualities have persisted.

Behind the older Iron Curtain there grew a spirit which drew back from the realistic and rationalistic West, and with the fervour of the mystic sought to develop Pan-Slavism. At the same time there was another spirit which cried out for the freedom and equality so stridently proclaimed by the French Revolution. The rule of autocracy had been long and hard, and the people must make an end of it. On the one hand, Aksakov and Katkov cried shame on 'the Rotten West', and on the other, Russia began to listen eagerly to Herzen, Proudhon, and Karl Marx. Nihilism and terrorism rose up against the secret police and the palace intrigues. Between these violently opposed factions men like Turgenev strove in vain. As has so often happened, the Liberal intelligentsia were not in touch with the people. The courtiers remained arrogantly confident in St Petersburg, and their enemies plotted violence in Moscow. The Social Revolutionaries talked politely of revolution. Behind all this scene the vast, inarticulate masses of Russia remained uninformed, oppressed, and helpless. Yet in spite of their apparent inertia there was an elemental faith that the politicians fifty years ago and the men of the Kremlin today, still underrate. The muzhik has known nothing of the virile Christianity which has crusaded against social injustice. He still waits the kind of awakening which came to England in the eighteenth century, and which created a new social conscience. Even the new situation created by the death of Stalin does not solve this age-old problem, though it may presently provide an answer to some of the questions.

Behind the Iron Curtain the Russian Sphinx stands. Does it really wear the face of a Stalin or is it a Russian muzhik, wistful, weary, and maybe wondering?

Will the new ideology overcome the elements which have been so long intertwined in Russian policy? Will the old idealism, with its mysticism, find new forms of expression, or will it be conquered, for the time, by materialism masquerading as idealism?

It is probably true to say that the Russian people are as religious at heart as are the British and Americans. However we may answer the riddle of the Russian Sphinx, we must beware of forming our conclusions from the reports of individuals or small organized groups. The more we can understand the Slav peoples as a whole—and we shall need infinite patience to bear with their obstinacy and their sense of grievance—the more likely we shall be to settle in a peaceful world.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

¹ Presidential Address to Royal Historical Society—Professor R. W. Seton-Watson, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.B.A.

Articles

SCIENCE AND RELIGION¹

A Changing Relationship

THERE must be very few people for whom the relation between scientific knowledge and religious faith is entirely happy. Yet, in a predominantly scientific age we must all wrestle with this problem, or our appeal to the community—and particularly to the younger part of it—will be limited and insufficient. It is because I think that that relationship is now changing that I have chosen to speak of it today. And I shall hope to show that from both sides there is taking place a movement toward mutual understanding. I believe that such a movement is profoundly significant and that it is of the Holy Spirit.

I wonder if I may begin with a personal illustration to exhibit the peculiar difficulty in which a thoughtful and sensitive person may easily find himself in this respect now.

In the same year that I went to Cambridge as a young undergraduate to get my first degree in science, Sigmund Freud published his book, *The Future of an Illusion*. I did not read it till a year later. But even though this was nearly twenty-five years ago I remember the extraordinary effect it had upon me. And in retrospect I am grateful for the confusion into which it threw me. Here was a first-rate psychologist showing how, out of primitive needs, whether of sex or hunger or death, primitive forms of religion could have arisen: and how, under the influence of science, both these and later more-developed forms of religion would come to be regarded simply as an illusion for which there was no future. Religion itself was a temporary phase through which man must pass, a kind of sublimation of desires and fears and repressions, whose barrenness, in an age of science, would soon become apparent to every thinking person. Did he not end that book with these words: 'Science is no illusion. But it would be an illusion to suppose that we could get anywhere else what it cannot give us'?

My confusion in all this was that so much of it seemed right. My own studies as a scientist showed me more and more of the austerity of its discipline, and its quite astonishing power of building up a coherent picture of the universe in which we live. There was strength, there was pattern, there was even grandeur in this—surely there must be truth also. It is still the case for me now, as it was then, that if much of the scientific discovery of these latter years does not carry the authentic note of truth, then I shall never know what is authentic and what is not. To deny science and scientific discovery is to do despite to the power and integrity of thought which God has given me. There are only two possibilities open to us in this age of science. Either Christianity can fit in with what I called the pattern of science, understanding it and being understood by it: or else, in opposition, it will be driven relentlessly out of every hedgehog position in which it would seek to entrench itself. If we cannot see the march of science as one aspect of the revelation of God, then it will not be long before the 'illusion' referred to by Freud, is recognized for what it is: and in that day God will be dead.

¹ Commemoration Address delivered at Handsworth College, Birmingham, 7th November 1952.

I want to begin there because it was for me a turning-point. The challenge presented by psychology must be seen as one aspect of a greater challenge, in which astrophysics, biology, geology, and the social sciences were involved. Either science and religion learn to speak in terms not only mutually intelligible but also mutually interdependent: or one of them must go—and that one will not be science. The lamentable story of the nineteenth century should have warned us that armed neutrality is not possible. You cannot have a 'scientific' sphere, and a 'religious' sphere, wholly separate and independent of each other. At least the results of trying to do this can be seen in this twentieth century. Both suffer. Religion is impoverished and becomes the sentimental refuge of old women: science is like a rudderless ship whose very excellence becomes her undoing. For power without purpose, knowledge without responsibility, science without conscience, these never have been, and never will be, a fulfilment for mankind. General Omar Bradley has put it in a very forthright way: 'Man is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the precarious secrets of life and death. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace, more about killing than we know about living. This is our twentieth-century's claim to distinction and to progress.' General Bradley is not quite right in his description either of science or spiritual conviction. But his words embody a large element of truth, and even if he may not legitimately be regarded as describing what *does* happen to our awareness of spiritual things, he certainly describes what *might* happen.

Einstein has put all this more simply and at the same time more truthfully, and with more discernment: 'Science without religion is lame: religion without science is blind.' And for myself, thinking of the twenty-odd years since I began to puzzle over these things, I am driven to say that it is only as I am able to hold these two strands of human experience together that I can make sense of the world in which I live, or realize the full nature and destiny of its inhabitants. If the glory of God does not shine through science, if the work of science cannot be seen as God's work, then, as a scientist, I am involved in a duality of experience which will ultimately become quite intolerable, and the more science I learn, the less whole and the more disintegrated will my life become. It will not only be the scientists who rebel from such a dichotomy.

Of course, it has not always been like this. This very science of which certain kinds of Christians seem so much afraid, is itself largely a child of Christian belief. I like to remember that when in 1266 the Somerset friar Roger Bacon was writing his *Opus Majus*—which was almost the first English text-book of science—he wrote, at the command of a pope, to show that the object of natural science was 'to assist the Church . . . by leading the mind through a study of the created works to a knowledge of the Creator'. I like to remember too that, in the words of our historian G. M. Trevelyan: 'Till the time of the Stuarts everyone who thought at all seriously about the world was Christian'—and that when, in Stuart times, the Royal Society was founded, its first members included two Bishops, one of whom was responsible for proposing Isaac Newton for membership. When people say that every discovery of a scientific law seems to them one more nail in God's coffin, I like to be able to reply that in the Middle Ages, long before even the way was known for the discovery of scientific laws (such as the law of gravitation) men were

hankering after them, convinced that the rationality of God would not be established till He could be vindicated in the order and constancy of Nature. People who claim that science is necessarily antagonistic to religion should remember that as late as 1830 when the British Association was being formed for the advancement of science, its first historian could write: 'To the Church, therefore, the British Association is deeply indebted.' And the reason for this is given in his next sentence: it is because 'true religion and true science ever lead to the same great end, manifesting and exalting the glory and goodness of the great object of our common worship'. Perhaps that is why its first two presidents were clergymen.

For us here, inheritors of that austere tradition of high thought which played so large a part in the influence of John Wesley, this same sense of the significance and relatedness of science with faith has its historic place. One of the books which I have at home, and in which from time to time I can find considerable enjoyment, is John Wesley's *Primitive Physick*. The prescriptions and recipes which he advocates there sound strangely to our modern ears; but they show him trying bravely to integrate such knowledge as there was with his Christian conception of the wholeness and health of life. One of the pieces of advice which he often gives is very simple and straightforward—'be electrified'—and he clinches his advice, as often as not, with the plain, yet devastating comment, which might almost have been lifted out of the pages of Euclid's geometry: 'Tried.' Now electricity was still new: and the experiments with frogs by Volta were yet to be performed. Here, then, was John Wesley, convinced that this new discovery must be fitted into the scheme of things in such a way that it made sense; here he was, grappling with it for the glory of God, as well as he knew how. For him, science was no enemy of the faith: rather was it to be understood and absorbed into the greater whole of human experience and divine intention.

We do well to remind ourselves, as people like Professor Butterfield have lately been doing for us, that science was literally cradled in the Christian faith. It is plain dishonesty to deny this. Yet Christians were among the first to turn the child against its parents, and so made possible that separation which, in the nineteenth century, developed into the Great Divorce. They did it by pretending that science could 'explain' certain types of behaviour, or certain phenomena: but that there were others which it could not explain. It was only these latter which revealed the hand of God. Here is an example to show you what I mean. The great Isaac Newton himself, after he had discovered the law of universal gravitation, found that, although it would explain the paths traced out by the planets in their journey round the sun, it would not explain why these planets rotated around their axes. In the case of our earth this diurnal rotation takes twenty-four hours and gives us the alternation of day and night. So this is what Newton wrote in a letter to Bentley, then Master of his own Cambridge college, Trinity: 'The diurnal rotation of the planets could not be derived from gravity, but required a divine hand to impress them.' Divine hand indeed! It was not long before Laplace was suggesting possible ways in which such a rotation could have originated. It is no matter whether his explanations were correct. As soon as any one possible way can be conceived, at that moment God becomes a hypothesis for which we have no further need! You cannot separate human experience into two parts and plant a hedge to mark the division, in much the same way that Descartes located the soul in the pineal gland because there seemed nowhere else for it. For every new discovery means replanting the

hedge farther away from you. And—if I may change the metaphor—you cannot say to science ‘thus far and no farther’; for if you do, each new discovery which enlarges science will push God farther away from the centre of the stage until at last He has been shoved right off into the wings, an actor with no part to play.

We are back again where we were before. Science and Christianity must go forward together, in mutual understanding. God cannot be at the end of science: He must be at the beginning, and right through it. I believe—and I shall return to this later—that there are certain insights which are given to the poet and the artist, which are not given to anyone else, and without which therefore the total life of the community is impoverished. For the more we know about God, the fuller and richer will our worship be. The scientist may be God’s messenger. It is sin to deny him and his element of Truth.

I have spoken of the lack of sympathy for science and scientific effort which paved the way for a separation between them and which resulted in the fear of science with which a good many Christians are still obsessed. But the fault was not all on one side. Scientists themselves have not played fair with religion, and particularly with religious experience. Perhaps they may be forgiven—at least some of them. For the very momentum of scientific discovery imposes its own conditions. And in trying to emulate the educated man in knowing ‘everything about something’, they have become so immersed in their speciality that they forget the other requirement, to know ‘something about everything’. When Descartes says: ‘Give me matter and motion and I’ll construct the Universe’; or when the oracular Professor Tyndall, presiding over the British Association at Belfast, confidently tells his audience that ‘as the bile is a secretion of the liver, so the mind is a secretion of the brain,’ we ought to be able to recognize both the truth of what they say, and the incompleteness of their picture. It is this concentrated gaze of a man in blinkers that most frequently leads the scientist into *gaucherie* and over-simplification. Freud’s—‘it would be an illusion to suppose that we could get anywhere else what science cannot give us’—is a case in point. So also are the words of one of our most famous atomic scientists: ‘Our civilization is founded on technology, and technology on science’—words which, if true, would deprive our lives of any cultural or spiritual influence. This pathetic belief in science still hangs on even in quarters where it should have withered away long years ago. Sometimes I wonder whether a hydrogen bomb and an almost universal death by radioactive dust would succeed in doing what the grim stark tragedy of Hiroshima and massed obliteration bombing have apparently failed to achieve. What for example could be more dangerous than this sort of facile over-simplification, from a recent book by a distinguished British scientist? After speaking of the chaos and uncertainty and fear of our generation, and of what he calls the chasm that he has seen open in the mind of man during the space of a single life-time, he concludes: ‘Can science save us? Let us stop pretending. If science cannot, nothing can.’ When I think of the hesitating letters that I try to write to friends who are bereaved: or when I think of the spontaneous scenes which I saw in London following the death of King George the Sixth, then I know, as we all know in our hearts, that science is not everything. For there are inner compulsions by which a man lives, given to him from beyond science. It may take a scientist to open our modern Pandora’s Box, but it will take more than a scientist to deal with the result.

You might think from all this that the prospect was not a happy one. I believe

you would be wrong. For it seems to me that the situation is changing. And Christianity now has a chance to achieve what would have seemed impossible a mere fifty years ago. In an age of science, Christians can say to the scientist: 'Come and bring your discoveries. For in part we understand them. Behind the misunderstandings and the false claims which, in our time, we each have made, there is much that is common. And we need one another in the good life.'

You will want to know why I think this. Let me tell you. It all begins with a growing recognition in science that there is no room for the hard dogmatism of a hundred years ago. Scientists—the best scientists—are more humble now. Gone is the old blatant confidence that science is everything. In its place there is springing up the view that science is one way of understanding and interpreting our experiences. But it is not unique, nor does it occupy a position wholly alien to other ways of interpreting. This, if it is true, is most important. Let us see how it has come about.

The change began when scientists started to think a little more about their methods and tradition. It soon became clear that there were certain pretty wide misconceptions which were generally accepted as being correct. 'Science is founded on facts,' people used to say, 'facts which are incontrovertible, hard facts with which no one can monkey about.' But now they strike a less strident note. For what are these so-called scientific facts? Is it a fact that the sun is so many million miles away?—for we cannot visit it to see. Is it a fact that each chromosome within a living cell contains so many thousand genes, determining hereditary characteristics of man and beast?—for we cannot see them. Are there atoms?—for we cannot hold them or weigh them or smell them. And as for the electron, the central item in modern physics, we know so little of its real existence that we are forced to call it a minute particle or a set of waves according to our type of measurement. I have spent most of my research energy in the last twenty years in trying to understand what the chemist means by a chemical bond uniting two atoms together to form a molecule. Now the chemical bond is a basic 'fact' of most chemistry text-books. But the conclusion to which we have now been led is that, in the last resort, there is no such thing as a chemical bond at all! It is a figment of our imagination—most useful and most satisfying: but it is not a fact. There *are* certain facts—the length of this ruler is twelve inches: the clock face reads half-past-four: when I put this thermometer in what I call sunshine, the level of the mercury rises. But these are not science. Facts themselves are of no interest: it is what we make of the facts that is science. It is a fact that when Galileo dropped stones from the tower of Pisa, they took a certain time to hit the ground. It is science when this is recognized as one example of the universal law of gravitation. But of course it is we who make and formulate the law. Science makes no laws: nor, in the last resort, does it reveal them: it is we who let our creative imagination dwell upon a set of separate facts and so bring order out of chaos. 'Science', said Max Planck, one of the really great architects of twentieth-century physics, 'is a constructed work of art: for new ideas are not generated by deduction, but by an artistically creative imagination.'

And, what is more, we do not achieve these creative ideas: they are given to us. 'Let us learn to dream, gentlemen', said the august Kekulé, one of the great chemists of the last century, recollecting his vision of the chemical architecture of benzene seen from the top of a London Omnibus: 'Let us learn to dream, and then we shall know the truth.' And Michael Faraday could echo his words: 'Let the

imagination go, guiding it by judgement and principle, but holding it in, and directing it by experiment.' Sir Lawrence Bragg, Lord Rutherford's successor at the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge, has put this very finely: 'When one has sought long for the clue to a secret of nature, and is rewarded by grasping some part of the answer, it comes as something new, more simple and at the same time more subtle, and more aesthetically satisfying, than anything one could have created in one's own mind.' This conviction, he says, 'is of something revealed, and not something imagined'.

When we can see science like this, it becomes clear how, in Eddington's phrase, 'the nature of all reality is spiritual, not material, nor a dualism of matter and spirit. The putting together of the adjective "material" and the noun "nature" does not make any sense.' The 'material nature' of a thing has no meaning. No wonder that physicists have spoken of the so-called physical as 'the clothing of a thought', 'the incarnation of an idea', or 'a garment'. And these are all words that they have used when describing modern science. If it is legitimate for us to call that which is beyond man, and which is known to him by reason, revelation, and creative imagination, God, then science takes its place as one of the languages in which God may be described. And how paltry, how trivial, by comparison with this view, become the words of that well-known scientist at the end of his otherwise most attractive series of broadcast talks on the nature of our incredible universe: 'Science', he said, 'is left with full possession of the physical world, while religion occupies some other world whose nature I can't even begin to imagine.' These two worlds are one, though seen in a different way and with characteristic features. It is my firm conviction that in proportion as we recover the sense and significance of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the agency of God's creative power within the Universe, so we shall be able to appreciate the unity of science and faith. The days of conflict are past: whether in physics or biology we now look for a synthesis. And we find the scientists—some of them—ready. Julian Huxley, for example, at the end of his book on biology, asserts that we come to a monistic conclusion. He claims that there is one fundamental substance, experienced both in what we conventionally call matter, and, no less, in what we conventionally call spirit.

We have recently had another excellent illustration of this, though the fact seems to have escaped much notice among Christians. In his Reith lectures a year or so ago, Professor J. Z. Young spoke of man as 'an animal made for communication', and he showed how, from the angle of scientific inquiry, we could not describe human beings and their development unless we included the central and characteristic fact that a man communicates with his fellows. Yet with this recognition we were able to understand him and the processes that have taken place to make him what he is, much more intelligently and completely than before. Man would not be man if he could not communicate with his fellows. Now surely what J. Z. Young has here been saying with his particular scientific insight, is precisely what St Paul said when he spoke of the Church as the Body of Christ, and ourselves severally members of it; or when Our Lord Himself spoke of the whole community of people as a family, linked together by common ties, and incomplete without each other. J. Z. Young has said, from his angle, just what Christians here always said, from theirs. One truth—but seen a little differently according to the point of view from which we ask our question and receive our answer.

Do you not see how all this lifts our discussion to an entirely new plane of

thought? If we can get this far, we are ready to open our hearts and minds to let science speak through them. Science becomes a platform on which we stand to get a wider revelation. So, when the astronomers tell us of the number of the stars, and of the prodigious processes of atomic transformation that go on within them, refuelling their giant fires; or when the anatomists tell us of the thousands of millions of nerve-endings and nerve-fibres inside our brain, forming one unbelievable network of tiny electrical circuits in which the pattern of electric currents is associated with the process of thinking; when the chemist tells us of the tiny quantities of each vitamin, without which our life cannot continue, and of the delicate balance which they maintain within our system; when the psychologist describes religious emotions and religious experiences and relates them to other aspects of human awareness; when the biologist traces for us some faint picture of the evolutionary process—then I say: Here may we see God translated into terms which my human mind can partly comprehend; thanks be to God for the revelation through His messengers, by which our worship is enriched, our sense of the wholeness of life is deepened, our Christian faith is carried a stage farther.

I do not mean that the revelation in science is complete. Of course it is not. For it needs the specifically Christian insights into the Person of Christ to save it from becoming pantheist or animist. It is because I believe that scientists are ready to accept the validity of some of these insights that I am hopeful for the future. Christianity in an age of science can be more brave, more comprehensive, more compelling than before. I have quoted the physicist Max Planck once: let me quote him again, in the words with which he concludes his *Scientific Autobiography*: 'Religion and natural science are fighting a joint battle in an incessant, never-relaxing crusade against scepticism and against dogmatism, against disbelief and against superstition, and the rallying cry in this crusade has always been and always will be: "On to God."'

I wonder if I may close by giving an analogy which I find helpful. It concerns what we see of a mountain when we look at it. And it is an experience that every mountaineer knows all too well. Suppose we stand on the north of Ben Nevis and look at the mountain, facing southwards. We see rock buttresses and rugged contours, which provide some excellent climbing for those who have a mind to that sort of thing. But if we go to the South, and look at it with our faces toward the North, we see a huge rolling contour, with one or two broad humps. There could scarcely be two pictures more different than these two. And yet others could be obtained if we went to the West along the Loch side. But there is only one mountain. What we have done is to see it differently because we have looked at it from different directions. Now every climber is aware that he only really knows the mountain when he has seen all these distinct partial views. You must look from the North, the South and the East and the West, before you realize the full stature of the mountain.

It is like this with our knowledge of God. Science—and Art and Poetry too—are partial revelations of His nature: so also is the ordinary experience of the simple Christian who is neither scientist, nor artist, nor poet, and knows nothing of all these subtleties. But the full stature and glory of God is only apprehended by those who can hold together two or more of these partial glimpses. Happy is he who can see more than one. For him the great words of Paul—'the length and breadth and depth and height'—begin to take on a glorious meaning. He begins to see the

astonishing magnificence of the scene upon which our little act is performed; and the bold imagery of the apostle—'to sum up all things in Christ, both things on earth and things in heaven'—and how nothing can separate us, absolutely nothing, from the love of God. Creation—and redemption—are seen in one grand sweep of the mind's eye, and the spirit is caught up into eternity in a moment of time, and we are lost in wonder, love, and praise.

C. A. COULSON

IN PRAISE OF HOSPITALITY

A New Testament Study

IN THE ancient East, hospitality seems to have been regarded as a sacred obligation that was assiduously fulfilled. It 'was practically an article of religion in the ancient world', says Moffatt.¹ In particular, the Greeks from early times set value on the duty of hospitality. Zeus Xenios, 'the god of guest and host', avenged with dire penalties any breach of this custom. Among the Hebrews also, hospitality ranks high as a religious and social observance. Abraham is quick to make ample provision for the three wayfarers at his tent door. (See Gn 18^{1f}. and cf. 24¹¹, Ex 2¹⁰). The generous reception of Elisha by the Shunammite woman and her husband (2 K 4^{1f}.) may be taken as typical of Israelite welcome. But hospitality was not limited to 'the man of God'. The sojourner or dependent foreigner shared in the provision and protection of the family or tribe, and this by divine command. (See Dt 10^{1f}., 14¹¹, Is 58⁷, Mal 3¹.) An early Christian writer² commends Abraham, Lot, and even Rahab for their hospitality.

In this as in other matters the New Testament conforms with both Hebraic and Greek antecedents. It shows, however, a marked advance in the ethic of hospitality. The duty was more rigorously enjoined. Hospitality must be 'constantly practised' (Ro 12¹³), and that 'ungrudgingly' (1 P 4⁵). It is part of the paraenetic or ethical exhortations of the New Testament, especially of the Pauline letters. These hortatory sections laid down general directions for the guidance of the early churches as a whole, a chart of conduct. If the story recorded in Luke 11^{1f}. shows the rudely awakened householder to be reluctant in his hospitality, since he yielded only to 'shameless persistence',³ it none the less illustrates the strong obligation of the neighbour to provide food for an unexpected guest. In the early Church it was a necessary qualification of a Bishop to dispense hospitality, and widows are commended for its exercise.⁴ Hermas⁵ sees under the figure of trees sheltering sheep 'Bishops and hospitable men who at all times received the servants of God into their houses gladly and without hypocrisy'. Hospitality would seem to be of a piece with contributing to the necessities of 'God's people', with which indeed it is linked in Romans 12¹³. By Clement of Rome⁶ hospitality is equated with faith and piety, and for Hermas⁷ it is 'the practice of benevolence'.

In this general picture we may distinguish several features. Hospitality was the practical expression of that spirit of brotherhood that characterized the early Christians. All the brethren shared the common benefits of family life. Nor was the alien left out. 'Do not forget', says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (13^{1f}.), 'to be hospitable to strangers', and adds, with a side long-glance at Genesis 18^{1f}., 'Who knows how august a personage one may entertain unawares?' The

motive, however, does not lie there. It is rooted in concern for the needs of the brethren. The sequence in Hebrews 13.1-2 is significant: 'brotherly love . . . hospitality.' Entrance into the intimacy of family life was a strong link in the chain that bound the primitive Christian community together.

The need of making due provision for itinerant apostles, prophets, and teachers was plain. For one thing, Christians were sometimes rendered homeless through persecution; for another, many of the inns of the time bore an unenviable reputation for extortionate charges and immoral practices.⁸ Jesus gladly availed Himself of the hospitality of friends, since He had nowhere 'to lay his head' (Mt 8.20). He stays with Andrew and Peter at Capernaum (Mt 8.14), with Mary, Martha, and Lazarus at Bethany (Jn 11.1ff.), and frequents the house of Simon the leper (Mt 26.6). Once at least He is a self-invited guest (Lk 19.7). The same privilege—we might almost say, right—He accords to His disciples. The Seventy, wherever they went on their mission, were to rely upon people's hospitality. Such free provision was blessed, its lack accursed (Lk 10.1-10ff.).

We may trace the same practice in the early Church. Peter lodges at Joppa in the house of Simon the tanner (Ac 9.42-43), Paul is the guest of Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth (Ac 18.1ff.), and the missionaries stay in Jerusalem with Mnason, 'a disciple of long standing' (Ac 21.16). Luke seems especially interested in the hosts he mentions. (See Ac 9.11, 17.1, 18.1) 'Do your best to speed Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way; see that they want for nothing' (Tit 3.13). The Apostolic exhortation to 'speed a brother on his way' is familiar. (See Ro 15.24; 1 Co 16.1-11; 3 Jn 6.) Justin⁹ tells us that the collection in Christian worship was devoted in part to 'strangers who are on a journey'.

The regular observance of hospitality is allied to the fact that some well-to-do Christians had necessarily to keep open house for their brethren for the purpose of fellowship and worship. In default of buildings the house-church served as the local centre of the life of the Church. The Apostles frequented the home of Mary, the mother of John Mark (Ac 12.1), and Gaius is host to Paul and to 'the whole Church' (Ro 16.5). Individual salutations are joined with 'the Church that is in their house'. (See Ro 16.5; 1 Co 16.1, Col 4.1, Philem 2.)

It is clear that whilst the first obligation of hospitality is to fellow-Christians its scope is widened to include every man in need. *Philoxenia* must be added to *philadelphia* (He 13.1) and in its wide compass even 'enemies' are ranged. (See Ro 12.10, citing Pr 25.1ff.) It is perhaps significant that Paul omits the words 'and the Lord shall reward thee'. Hospitality must be disinterested. There is no virtue as such in entertaining one's friends or relatives or rich neighbours, since one may expect an invitation in return! But when one's guests are the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, the sincerity of one's hospitality cannot be in doubt. (See Lk 14.13ff.) Here the *locus classicus* is the immortal story of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.30ff.). And just as the scope of hospitality is widened so its benefits are extended. Hospitality meets the basic needs of food and lodging. But it embraces more refined amenities such as anointing and the kiss of welcome. Here the Johannine story of the feet-washing is in point. Jesus is the perfect host (Jn 13.1ff.).

But we cannot miss the deeper significance in this emphasis on hospitality. The social factors, of which hospitality is not the least important, operate under the urge of faith. The ethical injunction is rooted in religious conviction. With

Paul this is fundamental, at least in his later writings. His ethic is a religious ethic. He enjoins liberality to fellow-Christians on the ground of the supreme self-abnegation of Christ in the Incarnation (2 Co 8). The respective obligations of wives and husbands, of children and fathers, of servants and masters, are all set in the context of the believer's mystical union with Christ; they are *in the Lord* (Col 3.10-4.). So is it with hospitality. Welcome shown to Christian disciples means service rendered to Christ (Mt 10.40, Jn 13.30), and conversely so (Mt 25.35). The fiery temper of James and John when the Samaritans refused to receive Jesus is rightly rebuked, but at least it indicates how deep an affront inhospitality was felt to be (Lk 9.55f.). It is 'hateful to God'.¹⁰ Jesus indeed makes it a ground for the final condemnation (Mt 25.44; cf. 10.14f.).¹¹

All the evidence shows that hospitality was one of the cardinal virtues practised by the early Christians as an integral part of the faith. So widespread was its observance that it lay open to imposition or abuse. 'Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord', says the *Didache* (xi.4f.), and continues, 'but let him not stay more than one day, or if need be a second as well; but if he stay three days, he is a false prophet.' We may test the genuineness of an apostle by the length of his stay! The writer of 2 John 10f. finds it necessary to give a warning against receiving non-Christian teachers who inculcate doctrines subversive of the faith, an admonition echoed in the *Didache* (xi.2). On the other hand 'letters of commendation' served to ensure hospitality for *bona fide* Christians on a journey.¹²

This last-mentioned point reminds us that the entertainment of travelling Christians aided directly the spread of the Gospel. In the privacy of the home much of the gospel story and its attendant facts would be retold. Who can say, for example, how much of the information on Christian origins that Luke gives he drew from Philip and his four daughters, whose home in Caesarea he shared for 'many days' (Ac 21.)? It must not be forgotten that the early Christians evangelized by word of mouth rather than by written documents. The words of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, may here be recalled: 'For I supposed that things out of books would not profit me so much as the utterances of a living voice which was still with us.'¹³

Tertullian¹⁴ has the remarkable statement: 'All churches are one, and the unity of the churches is shown by their peaceful intercommunion, the title of brethren, and the bond of hospitality.' Is there not here a word for our present ecclesiastical situation? May it not be that Church unity will be furthered less by assemblies and committees than by the necessary process of coming to know one another, with our various traditions and convictions, which Christian hospitality may well promote?

H. G. MEECHAM

¹ *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 224.

² Clement, 1 Corinthians 10r, 11r, 12r.

³ *anaideia*.

⁴ 1 Ti 3.2, 5.10; Tit 1.2.

⁵ *Sim.*, IX.xxvii.2.

⁶ 1 Corinthians 10r, 11r; cf. 1s.

⁷ *Mand.*, viii.10.

⁸ 'Under the pagan Empire, the hosteleries were for the most part little better than houses of ill-fame; and under the Christian Empire there seems to have been no serious improvement' (W. M. Ramsay, *Pauline Studies*, p.385).

⁹ *Apol.*, 1.27.

¹⁰ Clement, 1 Corinthians 35s.

¹¹ So also Diotrefes is censured because he does not 'receive the brethren and forbiddeth them that would' (3 John 10).

¹² Ro 16.1, 2 Co 3.1; cf. Ac 18.27.

¹³ Eusebius, *Ecl. Hist.*, iii.39.

¹⁴ 'Omnes ecclesiae una; probant unitatem ecclesiarum communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis' (*de praescr.* xx).

JESUS AS TEACHER

IT IS quite impossible to separate the Teacher and the Saviour in Jesus. It is one of the tragedies of Christian history that this has been attempted too often in the past, so much so indeed that one could speak of three separate focal centres for Christian interest, the one being Calvary with its Cross, another the Sermon on the Mount, and the third the Incarnation. There have been Schools of Christian thought and practice concentrating on each of these apart from the others with unhappy results. We must insist that it is one Christ who saves us, whether He is speaking or doing. A Saviour misunderstood is at last a Saviour disobeyed. To extol His teaching whilst failing to receive upon one's heart the full impact of His sacrificial love is to run the risk of a barren sentimentality.

We here confront the first unique feature of Christ as Teacher, i.e. the perfect way in which His life fulfils, illustrates, and confirms His teaching. It is no unauthenticated Gospel that He utters, He speaks the holy ethic that He Himself practices, His love corroborates His word. Did He teach 'love your enemies'? He Himself loved His enemies. Did He teach that a man's life consists not in the abundance of the things he possesses? He Himself practised a severe yet happy self-denial. Did He say: 'Let not your heart be troubled . . . believe in God'? He Himself, though 'The Man of Sorrows' was 'the Happy Christ' whose joy mounts ever higher the nearer He approaches the Cross.

HIS ORIGINALITY

There has been a tendency to suggest in the past that unless it could be shown that Jesus said what had never been said before, the superlative character of His mind and the originality of His thought might suffer by comparison with others. Many a pious soul has been disquieted to discover anticipations in pre-Christian teaching of some of the sayings of our Lord, though, to be sure, He so often states these positively where before they have been stated negatively. A case in point is the famous Confucian anticipation of the Golden Rule, which reads: 'Do not unto others what ye would not have them do to you.' This anxiety, however, misses the Christian insistence upon the status of Christ. We believe that He is the Eternal Christ out of the fullness of whose truth all pre-Christian truth, in so far as it is true, must have come. St Paul expresses this conception very clearly when speaking of the spiritual resource that Israel enjoyed during its wilderness wanderings, he says: 'That spiritual Rock was Christ.' We do not believe that the Logos came into being with the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem. 'In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.' Hence we should not be surprised to find Jesus repeating His own noblest truth uttered by others of other times and we should seek His originality rather in the consistently high level of His thought, and in the twofold fact that there is simply nothing in it, coming genuinely from Him, that our consciences can reject, whilst there is about His teaching an adequacy for life which is quite convincing.

THE SUPREME ELEMENT

What makes the teaching of Jesus supreme in all the world is its *revelation of God*, the consistency of its claim that the nature of the Divine Being is wholly Love. Christ's word for God, 'Father,' has an incalculable value. Notice how consistently

He uses it, never using the terms till then so common and persistent, the terms indicating sovereignty and obscuring tenderness. Again, it is true that the term 'Father' is used for God, for Deity, in pre-Christian thought, but only here and there and fitfully, over against a level of human fatherhood which, alas, contained cruel elements of pagan sovereignty. It was not merely that Christ used the term 'Father', but that He breathed into it through all He was and all He did such a spirit of love that He cleansed the very term that He used of all that domestic tyranny which disfigured fatherhood even in Israel.

There is something quite fascinating about the subtle way in which Jesus cleanses our human thought of God by the very statement of His human ethic. In the famous Sermon on the Mount, after setting forth the principle of a vast tenderness as the supreme morality for man, culminating in the challenge, 'Love your enemies', 'Pray for them that despitefully use you', He concentrates all His thought into a supreme reason for adopting such a morality, i.e. 'That ye may be sons of your Father which is in Heaven'. He thus clothes the character of God in the lineaments He has been prescribing for God's children. In this way Jesus binds together into one consistent whole His conception of God and Man.

One of the mountain peaks of revelation of the Divine character in the teaching of our Lord is undoubtedly His loveliest parable, the story of the Prodigal Son. Here the father is all tenderness from beginning to end of the story. One needs to know the rather immense dignity which obtains between Eastern parenthood and Eastern sonship to appreciate the radical transformation contained in the simple sentence: 'His father *ran* and fell on his neck and kissed him.' The word '*ran*' there could be more literally translated '*raced*'. It describes the utmost urgency and haste. It has in it all the homeliness of a vast, ungovernable desire; it is the love of God in a hurry! But there is one other touch in that parable which is too seldom appreciated and that is the exquisite gentleness of the father with his elder son. The elder son in the parable represents, of course, the Pharisaic temperament, that hypocritical moral snobbishness which seems to have tried the spirit of our Lord more than anything else in our human world. Yet Jesus describes this type as being dealt with very gently by God: 'And his father came out and entreated him saying, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.'

This is the fundamental element of the teaching of Jesus which we need to bear in mind when we try to estimate His sterner utterances. Are we likely in the light of this to be doing real justice to the genius of our Lord when we take His utterances about retribution at the level of the world's types of judgement?

We dare not permit the Gospel of Love to decline into the gospel of fear which it is bound to do unless love in its full tenderness is kept quite paramount. In human evolution fear is an earlier element than the experience of love and any emphasis upon it echoes more deeply and reverberates more thunderously in the human situation than it is possible for love as yet to do. Yet the reaction of fear is invariably and incorrigibly selfish. Any altruism that it displays is fictitious and self-serving, so that the problem of the redemption of the human spirit here reaches a kind of impasse. Fear is in possession of the constitution of man; Love is too recent to be very powerful. What is the solution? The only answer is Love's capacity to suffer and by its suffering so to display its genuineness, its own incorrigible tenderness, that man's constitution shall be wrested away from fear and brought under the dominance of love. Whilst this is Christ's peculiar work, since

'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself', all who come to understand and appreciate and love Jesus are inevitably called into the fellowship of His suffering and drawn into His work of redemption so that His Spirit is perpetually manifested in and through them to the world.

OTHER VITAL FEATURES

The teaching of Our Lord is characterized by four other most vital features:

(1) *Authority*. The people were impressed by the fact that Jesus did not follow the customary method pursued by the scribes and rabbis in their teaching, which was mainly a method of quotation. What small modicum of original truth was presented was floated upon a mass of traditional statement and previous opinion, and the longer the authority had been dead the more weighty was the corroboration. But Jesus spoke directly from His own conscience and intuition; from personal communion with the Father. One can imagine something of the shock it must have been to His hearers to listen to those words: 'Ye have heard it said of old time . . . but I say unto you. . . .' There is no doubt that one considerable element in the authority of Christ's teaching was and still is the self-evident quality of His utterances. They did not need to appeal to argument, they struck home to conscience and thought like so many rays of piercing and sometimes dazzling light.

A still greater element in His authority as we have already noted, was the manifest quality of the life that so perfectly supported the whole of His teaching. Even when He uttered that mighty invitation, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden', the high personal claim implied in His invitation raised no sense of incongruity in the minds of His hearers. If this factor of authority was strong with His hearers it becomes overwhelming for subsequent generations who have the privilege of seeing the whole of His life as the vivid background of the whole of His teaching. He who declared, 'If it were not so I would have told you; I go to prepare a place for you', returned from death and tarried with His disciples, and disappeared so gently into the larger world as to carry irresistibly their communion with Him into the Unseen.

(2) *Paradox*. It is one of the indications of a profundity in Jesus both alluring and satisfying, that His teaching is filled with paradox. This Greek word, which means literally 'against reason' is used for a form of statement in which there seems to be a direct contradiction in terms. One of the plainest examples is St Paul's sentence: 'When I am weak, then am I strong.' It is interesting to reflect that Paul himself is full of paradox too, which would seem to indicate that in the rabbinical schools there was some love of this teasing form of statement. In our own time there is a very general conviction that truth cannot be stated adequately except by paradox, just as the world of nature seems to be composed of a balance of forces so finely related that they are an exquisite reconciliation of opposites.

One of the mistakes that is constantly made is to take some section of the teaching of Jesus and ignore other teaching of His which curiously balances it. We mark in Jesus Himself a wonderful reconciliation of certain main paradoxes in life. How exquisitely *Wisdom* and *Simplicity* are blended in Him. His teaching, so simple as to be understood by a little child, is nevertheless so profound as to be still teasing the best minds of our time. There is in Him, too, the paradox of *Dignity* and *Humility*. He who promised Paradise to the dying thief was able to describe

Himself as 'lowly of heart', a statement which since it cannot be the height of megalomania, can only be the utmost depth of humility. In Him, too, is embodied the paradox of *Joy* and *Suffering*; the nearer He draws to His Cross, the more radiant becomes His joy. Finally, there is in Him the strange yet adequate paradox of *Severity* and *Gentleness*. His castigation of the Pharisees is revealed in the very text of the Gospels as a surgical operation only permissible to a mighty love. It is not for nothing that the terrible 23rd Chapter of St Matthew concludes upon the note of lament: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered you as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, but ye would not.' One cannot stress too strongly the conviction that the resolution of this particular paradox is not to be found in harking back to any terrorism in God, but only in the discovery of the rich, deep adequate psychology of love.

(3) *Humanity*. 'Without a parable spake He not unto them.' There is revealed in this sentence an exquisite consideration on the part of Jesus for the lowly multitude and the average man. It is the height of genius to be able to 'enter in at lowly doors' and those unforgettable stories that He told, whilst so characteristic of the East, severed Him rather sharply from the 'highbrows' who rejoiced in mysteries withheld from the 'lowbrows', and revealed His love of humanity and His rejoicing in the simplicities of everyday life. The birds and the flowers; the pots and pans; the village and the street; the farm and the vineyard; the daily occupation; the carpenter's shop; the widow and her struggle; the tax-collector and his problems; even the prostitute and her tragedy; these things are not too common for His consideration whose joy it was to be 'made in the likeness of man' and to 'suffer in all points as we ourselves, yet without sin'.

A special instance of this human outlook of Jesus is His loving championship of little children. No one ever said such beautiful things about boys and girls as did our Lord. If we take but three sublime utterances which are brought close together by Matthew in his Chapters 18 and 19, they are nobler than anything contained elsewhere in human speech: 'Whosoever would be great among you, let him become as a little child.' 'Except ye turn and become as this little child ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven.' 'Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven.' And yet again: 'Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.' No wonder mothers brought their little ones to Him to be blessed! He has been blessing the children ever since.

There was, however, something more than consideration in His story-telling. There was the art of the supreme educator. He knew the value of simile and the limitations of metaphor, and the appeal of a simple tale. Yet more profound than all this was His perception of the moral test involved in such indirect teaching. The story might be taken at its face value and left, or it might be analysed for its moral content; and the initiative for this was left to His hearers. Thus His story method became a test of sincerity and a judgement upon the insincere. This is the meaning of His reference to that severe passage in Isaiah which He made in His story of the Sower, where He says: 'Therefore tell I them parables because they seeing see not, and hearing hear not, neither do they understand, and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias; which saith, by hearing ye shall hear, and shall

not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive.' This is a lament with a purpose, for it shows that Jesus used the story method to tease or to sting these gross hearts awake. Such was His deep solicitude even for the unworthy and those who were deliberately blind and deaf to truth.

(4) *Timelessness*: The teaching of Jesus does not date, it is as fresh today as when He first uttered it, for all the re-utterance that has occurred in nearly two thousand years. There is at least one delightful historical instance of this that one is never tired of quoting. The great nineteenth-century philosopher, Herbert Spencer, once set out to show in two elaborately argued volumes the whole duty of man, i.e. his *Data of Ethics*. In this book he presents with a considerable amount of ingenuity the conclusion that righteousness for man consists in the most exquisite blending of Egoism and Altruism. He actually succeeds after elaborate effort in echoing the special emphasis that Jesus made so long ago—'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'! This saying was, on the part of Jesus, a quotation from Leviticus, but in its original context it has only a narrow reference to one's fellow-countrymen. It was left to Jesus to lift it out of its context and write it across the face of the world. The great philosopher took two volumes to say what he felt was rather fresh for his day and generation, but all he said was what Jesus stated long ago in one sentence!

The teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom is so exalted and adequate that it escapes those changes in the scientific outlook upon the universe which have been so considerable in the history of our civilization. The tremendous swing-over, for example, from the conception of the earth as the focal centre of the solar system with the sun and stars moving round it which was, of course, the outlook upon the universe under which the Scriptures were written—to the view now endorsed by science of the sun as the centre of the solar system with the earth moving round it, and the consequent loss of direction for such conceptions as Heaven and Hell; the destruction of such ideas as an 'up' and 'down' in reference to humanity's position in the system—these changes are seen as entirely without effect upon the teaching of our Lord, whose ideas ride so high and plough so deep as to escape even so profound an alteration of view.

Finally, we may refresh our minds once again with the fact that this Teacher is also Saviour. His teaching travels hand in hand with His life. All that He *said*, He also *was*—no, better still, He *is!* and *is for ever!*

A. D. BELDEN

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND RANDALL CREMER

AT THE present time, the tide of literature through creeks and inlets making, seems to be creating new channels. It has set writers dredging and finding the lives of the Victorian century worth refurbishing with modern commentaries.

After Waterloo, the reactionary Tory Government was followed by Reform agitation, when the old Irishman who had brought Napoleon down at Waterloo, fled for his life from a London mob. Then came the hungry Forties, and the sanctimonious Fifties and the Great Exhibition with bread and circuses, the clown being Napoleon the Third. And now, one hundred years later, our readers, tired of war stories, are finding old truths stranger than fiction in old biographies.

One difficulty in reading Methodist biography is that the writers seemed to forget that a living dog is better than a dead lion, and their pages comprise about twenty-five per cent of life and seventy-five per cent of death. A visit to the mouldering library at Wesley's House will confirm this. It may be that the writers were so full of setting their affections on things above, that they felt called on to ignore the trials and events of the seventy years' life, and to point the moral of the last few days to confirm Wesley's dictum that 'Our people die well'. So we know little of the childhood of the baby born in 1828 and baptized at the Wesleyan Chapel at Fareham, where his mother lived. His father had wandered from Warminster in Wiltshire, like many others, leading a nomadic life in search of work, before he abandoned his family.

Cremer once in the House of Commons gave a sketch of his childhood. His mother kept a Dame-School and had six shillings a week to keep herself and three children. The breakfast under this godly and careful woman was three thin slices of bread and a scrape of butter, with a cup of weak tea—no milk or sugar. Dinner was boiled 'duff', flour and water stewed with potatoes, and a few ounces of meat sometimes. Tea was like breakfast; there was no supper and the children went to bed hungrier than wolves. He testified that a gift of food and flannel shirts saved his life.

Those were the days when Wesleyans went to Church on Sunday mornings and to Chapel in the evening. Stories of the working-class children at that period are much the same—want and poverty, occasional charity, strict home discipline, and a general air of 'God bless the Squire and his relations, and keep us in our proper stations'.

His first job at twelve years old was in a shipyard from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., at two shillings a week, but the open-air life and sea water helped to improve his health, and a builder relative, noting signs of worth, took him on without a premium. People in Fareham in after years recalled his inquiring mind, and endless discussions, so that his master rebuked him; though one would have thought that bricklaying was suited to wrangling, judging by the Tower of Babel. Amongst other subjects, Peace and the avoidance of War had their place, for the French had a new generation that knew not Napoleon, and the English Press were uniting about the hereditary foe. This was encouraged by the propertied classes, who felt with fear and dismay the rise of the Chartists, and were enrolling themselves as special constables.

Cremer, the Methodist youth, held the same view as Disraeli the extreme

radical, who at his first election described England as the land of two nations, the Haves and the Have Nots. As a builder and carpenter, Cremer the radical was able to attend those new Mechanics' Institutes, founded by far-seeing gentry as a palliative against Chartism, and having migrated to London (wages sixpence an hour and no half-day on Saturdays), he heard a lecture on Peace and decided to devote his life to its advancement.

For this radical youth, however, there was also work at home, for he formed the Carpenters' Union, to press for ninepence an hour.

At this time, London was spreading out in every direction—you remember that Soames Forsyte was essentially a man of property—streets of houses and not mean ones, either. Blackheath, Peckham, Clapham, Chelsea, Bayswater, and so on, have those large houses which are now quite unworkable without the 'slaves' of the Victorian age. It is possible that old Jolyon Forsyte was the master-builder who threatened to shoot Cremer if he formed a branch of the Union in his yard. After a lock-out of 70,000 hands by the Master Builders, and a gain of a half-holiday on Saturday, the employers continued to pile up their fortunes and curse the radicals.

But Labour in London did not provide a sufficient platform for the romantic, adventurous, and unsettled radical who took thence-forward as his text: 'Peace hath her victories no less renowned than War.'

The first chance of interference in World affairs occurred in the American Civil War, over the case of the Alabama Claims in 1863. Space does not permit a detailed account of the affair, which is now history and is well worth a study today. Suffice it to say that English political leaders took the side of the Southern States, and the working-class radicals were with Abraham Lincoln and the North. Cremer and his associates convened a meeting at St James's Hall, presided over by John Bright, and the following resolution was passed: 'That the Government of this country, in permitting the pirate ship *Alabama* to leave Liverpool, was guilty of negligence and has failed in its duty to a friendly nation.' The long dispute which threatened war between the United States and Britain, was settled in 1872 at Geneva, when a Court of Arbitration declared that Great Britain was liable for damages done by the guns of the *Alabama*, and a peaceful settlement was made.

Cremer had been busy for Peace in other ways, in fact he seemed to wage a perpetual war for peace and freedom. His share in the visit of Garibaldi to this country included addressing a cheering crowd whilst clinging to the cross-bar of a lamp-post. He also took a vigorous part in the deportation from this country of a stormy petrel of revolution, one General Cluseret, who approached Cremer's newly formed International Working Men's Association. (This body included an obscure German refugee, studying at the British Museum—the name—Karl Marx.) Cluseret's proposal was to provoke a revolution in London by bringing from Ireland 2,000 Fenians, armed with knives and *batons ferrés*. Later, Cluseret was the Communist Leader in the short-lived Paris Commune.

About this time, Cremer found the Methodist colour of his Church was too blue for his politics, and though now associated with Thomas Burt, the original of the Labour Party and a staunch Methodist, he drifted toward the Left and joined the Independents, more in accord with his own temperament of movement and enthusiasm.

We are not concerned with his home politics, though he was a Liberal for twenty-

three years. Most political biographies are much the same: the agony of elections, the frustration of ambitions, the victories of causes, and the discoveries that it is better to travel hopefully than to arrive, and the inevitable change from left wing to right wing with the flux of time.

Though Cremer was elected for Haggerston (the name of the old village has almost disappeared from the maps of London) in 1885 and sat through storm and stress till 1908, his real life and work was International Peace, which led him to hasten to and fro, disturbing diplomats and embassies, ministers of Interiors and Foreign Secretaries. He must have been one of the earliest apostles of peace to realize that sooner or later America could not remain Isolationist; so after consulting his friend, Victor Hugo, he obtained the ear of the Steel King of the U.S.A., Andrew Carnegie, in his dream of a High Court of Nations to end all disputes by just and peaceful judgements. And with the great resources of a Carnegie behind the International Arbitration League and its organ, *The Arbitrator*, Cremer became a force which all the uneasy nations of Europe, overcrowded and looking for outlets in other continents, had to reckon with, and the western world began to pay lip service to the name of peace.

In England, the forty-four years between 1870 and 1914 were looked on as a time of profound peace, and yet there occurred the Russo-Turkish War, the Spanish American War, and the Russo-Japanese War; also our little Boer War, which we looked on as one of the many African alarms, incidental to the building of the British Empire. It was due to the efforts of Cremer during that period of expansion that the whole world was not riddled with war in every direction.

Among Cremer's great friends was Victor Hugo, who said to him: 'So long as I have breath I will combat War.' By the associates gathered about him in the International League, Cremer was described as the Torch Bearer of Peace, and the Guerilla of Peace, such was the affection and hope that he inspired. It was a time when travel with a mission appealed to the prosperous middle classes (Sir Henry Lunn, the Methodist discoverer of religious gatherings at Alpine beauty spots has left a memory which is still cherished), and Cremer was ever on the move with his Torch of Peace. But he too made discoveries. Like young Bernard Shaw, as he fled from Trafalgar Square on Bloody Sunday, Cremer found that revolutions were only successful when the people had already captured the police; so 1887 witnessed the birth of his other movement, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, to which all elected members of a government should be eligible to attend a biennial session, and in 1895 this body took the first modest steps toward the International Court of Arbitration and Justice, at the Hague.

Reading Evans's *Life of Cremer*, it is hard to say whether occasions made Cremer or Cremer made occasions. For hard upon the suggestion of the Court of Justice, in 1898 all Europe was amazed when the Czar awoke to the claims of peace and issued a rescript about it to all the Embassies accredited to the Court of St Petersburg. The incarnation of militarism seemed to think that war was a ruinous absurdity. Probably the Russo-Japanese War had clarified his thoughts, for it was the last war fought by Holy Russia before she collapsed in 1917. At any rate, Alfred Nobel wished to join in the good work and at a meeting in Sweden in 1903, the Nobel Peace Prize of £8,000 was awarded to Cremer, and the Guerilla of Peace handed the entire fund over to the International Arbitration League as a perpetual endowment to carry on the cause.

During these years, Carnegie had been completing the Palace of Peace at the Hague, where in 1907 the second World Peace Conference was held, under the presidency of the Russian Delegate, De Nelidoff. This was Cremer's Pisgah and his immense energy and enthusiasm seemed to be exhausted, for the next year he suddenly died. Born a Methodist, he lived an Independent, and died a Baptist—truly a Catholic. At his graveside a mourner proclaimed: 'Born in Poverty, he enriched Humanity.' His statue was placed at the entrance to the Palace of Peace in 1914. What a tragic coincidence! That was the year when Mars and Bellona mocked at the work to which he had devoted his life, and the lamps went out all over Europe, and as we see it now, mankind entered the Valley of the Shadow of Death, in which we still live.

Meanwhile, the two organizations founded on the Nobel funds, given by Cremer to perpetuate his hopes and aims, continue their unostentatious work.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union aims at uniting elected persons in a common aim toward peace.

The International Arbitration League, with its organ *The Arbitrator*, carries on its educational work, and being a non-political body has its correspondents and associates throughout the world. Indeed, it would seem that its influence overseas is greater than in the crowded United Kingdom, where there is such competition in good works. The President this year is Lord Ammon, a staunch Methodist, and the Vice-Presidents include Methodist names like Henry Bett, Isaac Foot, William F. Lofthouse, Donald Soper, Arthur Henderson, and Leslie F. Church.

Such of my readers as are attracted by the story of Cremer, and its influence still present in the world, may like to see the League's organ, *The Arbitrator*, and join us.

The proverb says: 'Hope deferred makes the heart sick.' But we who have survived the failure of the first experiment in World Peace and the second World War, need not despair if the United Nations should not fulfil our hopes, for Man's extremity is God's opportunity. If ever there was a time for putting a cheerful courage on, it is today, in the conviction that 'God is working His purpose out . . . and the time shall surely be, when the earth shall be full of the Glory of God, as the waters cover the sea'.

T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN

REPORT ON CHINA

IT IS NOW just over three years since China finally broke away from the Western group of nations and threw in her lot with the new Communist world, based on Moscow. She is now snugly behind the Iron Curtain, sealed away from the rest of the world; but we should try to make it our business to know what happens to a country when it turns its back on the Western way of life and follows the new Red Star. Indeed, it is vastly important that we (as well as Eastern countries which are doubtless poised in uncertainty) should know how the new experiment in living is turning out.

A good deal more is known, of course, than is commonly supposed; but it is clear that the authorities in the New China are seriously worried by the amount of detailed news which is getting through. So perhaps we may expect to hear less and less. There is pressure, too, on China from Communist parties in other parts of the world, for they have voiced concern and embarrassment at the way in which 'outsiders' are able to watch the process of a Communist revolution.

It is true that we do occasionally hear reports from individuals and delegations who return by the overland route from Peking through Moscow and Eastern Europe, but something more objective is needed. To learn directly about China, one must have certain credentials and be in possession of a special invitation (only offered to the favoured few) and thus we are probably right to suspect what we hear from such travelling salesmen.

What sort of report on China under Communism can we give after three years of the new form of government? Our objectivity and honesty will also in turn be suspect, but let us at least make the attempt to assess the situation. . . .

A SUICIDE SOCIETY

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine was the year of victory, which saw the triumph of the Communist armies and the escape of the remnants of the Nationalist régime to Formosa.

Nineteen hundred and fifty was the year of pacification, in which armed opposition was crushed, and the whole country brought under the effective control of the new Central government.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one was the year of mass executions, in which certain sections of the population, hostile to Communism, such as landlords, unrepentant nationalists and individuals with an anti-revolutionary past, were liquidated by the firing squad.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was a year of suicides.

As with the estimate of the number of those who were shot in 1951, so is it difficult to assess the number of suicides in China last year, but the two movements are comparable. If we say that as many people committed suicide in China in 1952 as were shot in 1951 we shall be near the truth. Suicide, therefore, was on a very considerable scale last year, so that we are not wrong in selecting it as the factor for the year. Like the campaigns of the past—land reform, compulsory savings, trials of reactionaries—this new factor has been nation-wide, from the great coastal cities to the remote townships of the interior.

It is very easy for the Westerner to miss the significance of this incontrovertible wave of suicides in China during 1952. In our civilization we have regarded suicide

as a dishonourable end, so dishonourable indeed that we feel that the balance of the mind must be temporarily upset. Now in China this is not so: from time immemorial suicide has been an honourable way of protesting against the hardship of an oppressor. For a person treated with ignominy and shame, and being without redress, self-destruction has always been the way out as well as an eloquent protest against oppression. In Chinese society, wives ill-treated by their husbands, or government officials ashamed of some national wrong, commit suicide as the strongest protest they can make against the wrong suffered; and, be it noted, it has been accepted as primarily a protest, rather than a seeking of relief from an intolerable burden.

While it may be true that some have chosen this path to put an end to fear, for

he who cuts off twenty years of life,
cuts off so many years of fearing death,

the unquestionable significance of this factor in the New China is that after three years of Communist rule there is a large-scale protest against the tight totalitarianism that the new régime has brought. How has it come about that in a land-area as big as Europe, almost everywhere in the country vast numbers of people have been brought—*independent of each other*—to the point of doing away with themselves?

It all began in one of the nation-wide campaigns, organized by the Central government, which follow each other with the regularity of the seasons of the year, and which have been one of the strongest characteristics of the Chinese Communist revolution. The opening moves of this campaign began toward the end of 1951 with the whole propaganda and publicity machine turned against corruption, waste, and red-tape in Government agencies. Everyone connected with government and administration, all the schools and nationalized hospitals, and even the Communist party itself, were brought under the fierce glare of examination and criticism. Economic and academic considerations were not allowed to stand in the way of this intense soul-searching; even the production of the factories and the studies of the universities were halted to give time for a thorough-going purge of everyone connected with the Government. Absolute and unquestioned obedience to the Communist Government was the criterion—individuals found guilty of putting their own, or family, interests before those of the State were dealt with as people guilty of crime. For example, a professor who resisted appointment to another institution away from home, a graduate who insisted on choosing his own career, a local officer relaxing into the enjoyment of good food and comfort, after years of revolutionary struggle—such were the people who came in for the crossfire of accusation.

The anti-communist will immediately say that this shows that the Communists have been no more successful in keeping down corruption in China than were the Nationalists. On the contrary, nothing like the massive corruption of the pre-communist era has been revealed, but this shows rather the unflinching determination of the Communists that the corruption of the past shall not be allowed to revive.

At the beginning of 1952, while this campaign was in progress, and peoples' minds were fascinated with the spectacle of colossal Government departments putting themselves through a self-inflicted purgatory, a second campaign opened to deal with corruption and unlawful behaviour in the business and professional classes. The Communist revolution in its initial stages was directed chiefly against

the landlord class (a class which has been finally and completely dealt with and can never again be a menace), whilst the small capitalists and merchants escaped attention. Indeed, their co-operation had been sought. But now it was their turn. The first campaign was almost forgotten in the rigours of the second; all the hysteria of the killing of the landlords, of the mass-executions of the reactionaries, was revived in the clean-up of the *bourgeoisie*.

Every possible encouragement was given to all sections of the population to accuse individuals of the middle-class who had been guilty of bribery, tax-evasion, and countless other forms of corruption. Pressure was brought on workers and employees to denounce managers and employers; school-children were pressed to inform against their parents; women's organizations were exhorted to concentrate upon publicly accusing husbands of illegal business deals. With the clamour for accusation went a demand on every business man for a confession of corruption. Accusation and confession—these were the two notes reiterated by every means of propaganda, day after day for months.

The business people had already been deprived of a great deal of their wealth by earlier compulsory loans and a variety of taxes; now, as confessions were wrung out of them by this war of nerves, they were called upon to make atonement for the corruption of the past by exorbitant cash-donations to the Government, and so the process of the impoverishment of the middle-class continued.

At the height of this campaign (and as far as we know there has been nothing in the eastern European Communist States to compare with it) the merchants and business people were described as frightened people, sitting in their shops and offices haggard after weary investigation and confession, as lifeless as clay gods in a heathen temple. Thus there is one section of the population which is completely disillusioned about Communism: the early promise of harmony and co-operation has yielded nothing but bitter fruit. Realizing however that there is now no other alternative, that the present form of society appears to be permanent, large numbers of merchants and business people made their final protest against the New China by flinging themselves publicly from high buildings in the cities, or by doing away with themselves by hanging or poison. In one modern city so many businessmen were flinging themselves from buildings into the streets below that they became a positive menace.

The first thing we would say, therefore, in our report on China is that a certain section of the nation has registered a notable protest against the tyranny of the present régime. When Communism first became established, the greater proportion of the population welcomed it, whilst other sections objected inwardly but outwardly acquiesced. Now, however, one section has become so desperate that it has declared its protest by choosing death rather than continue ostensible acquiescence.

The second thing is the permanence of the régime that has settled on China. Those who desire it—and it is very doubtful that they are in the majority—realize that there is now no prospect of shaking off the shackles of Communism. That is to say, the New China appears as well-founded and rigid from within as it does from without. The passage of three years since those tremendous days of its triumph has not, as some expected, shown the unsuitability of Communism to China, or revealed that its traditional ways of life would re-emerge.

Two years ago it was possible to speak of the enthusiastic, mass support of the Chinese for the new regime. That is less true now: there has been a noticeable

decline in the warmth of support. It was easier to agree with Chinese Communism immediately after its victory than today, for then it appeared reasonably tolerant and urbane, actively seeking the favour of almost all classes. Time has shown to the Chinese that their leaders are determined upon the unbending, uncompromising application of modern Communism, without seeking to mitigate in the least the brutality and bitterness which such a revolution involves. The ferocity of the onslaught has caused many to shudder, and rightly so. I recall one day in 1951, standing beside a thoughtful Chinese, as we watched a group of Communist soldiers march past, and hearing him observe solemnly, 'These people . . . they have no love.' He was learning. . . .

The natural support has also declined because the effective control over the lives of the people has been pushed to such limits that more and more freedom has disappeared, and the hapless Chinese have increasingly found themselves in the grip of an extremely strict and intolerant tyranny. Public acclamation for the Government is just as fulsome as it was three years ago, but it is less sincerely felt.

I understand, too, that the peasants—that enormous slice of the population which formed the bedrock of the revolution—are less enthusiastic now than they were in those ecstatic first days when they received the title-deeds to their land. The division of land is virtually completed; the bad old days of subservience to a landlord have gone; paying heavy rent, in good seasons and bad, has disappeared, too, and the peasant has the moral satisfaction of not being subject to his neighbour. In the early days of reform his satisfaction outweighed his resentment at being organized by Government, but now the novelty of owning his own land is wearing thin, and he sets against it three things: (1) that he now pays about as much grain-tax as he formerly paid rent, and to precisely as exacting a master; (2) that he is being more and more organized and indoctrinated, and to an illiterate peasant this grows irksome; and (3) that he is not now one of the pampered 'oppressed class' that he was before land division. Indeed, correct political ideas and attitudes are now expected from the peasants and if they cannot conform to the demand they find themselves in hot water like everyone else.

FORCED LABOUR

An entirely new feature of life in China during the last year or so has been the appearance of the forced labour gang. I do not suppose China has ever seen anything like it before. Should you perchance find yourself standing on the pavement of an ordinary Chinese city street in the early evening you will see the march past of fifty or a hundred workers, hoes and shovels over their shoulders, shouting occasional slogans such as 'Long live Mao-tze-tung!' or the like, or joining half-heartedly in a political song. At the outer edge are well-armed soldiers with bayonets fixed, whilst bringing up the rear will be a jeep mounting a machine-gun which is trained on the workers. The men are going back to the labour barracks after a day spent in the fields, building or road-making.

These workers are continually under guard, disciplined as an army and assiduously indoctrinated for the good of their souls. In China the mass-executions were not done secretly, but used as public propaganda; similarly, these creatures are not sent to some secluded Siberia for social and political readjustment but the process is done locally, with daily marches through the streets to impress the general population.

In fact, slave-labour, which is now an accepted economic fact in China, is the aftermath of the mass-executions of 1951, when from the enormous prison population of the politically undesirable the cream was skimmed off and dealt with summarily. Those who escaped death then are now being given remedial treatment with the chance to work out their own salvation by forced labour. Also (and this is another new feature) the peasants are being weeded out, for they are not all willing to be organized by political hacks, and consequently a large proportion of the labour-gangs is formed from peasants reluctant to conform to Communism.

CHINA AND RUSSIA

At the end of three years' collaboration between China and Russia, it is worth while examining the relationship which exists between the two countries. At the outset some said that collaboration could not possibly last long, for Russia desired only a weak China and was intent upon devouring part of it, anyway; others declared that China would become a second Tito in a very short time.

Neither point of view is true; indeed, they seem to be getting along very well together and there are no signs of a breakdown. Korea, of course, must be a most complicated problem, with China supplying the troops and Russia the armaments; yet everything seems to be going along smoothly. Mao-tze-tung has repeatedly stated that China cannot sit on the fence but must deliberately jump to one side or the other. He has led China unhesitatingly into the totalitarian camp, and it would seem that he fulfils his obligations up to the hilt. And Russia honourably hands back the Changchun railway.

Nevertheless, I can well imagine Mao's difficulties. Last year a Chinese intellectual with whom I was talking picked up the newspaper and selected a phrase from the daily dose of propaganda and read it dramatically to me in Chinese: 'Joseph Stalin is as a father and mother to the Chinese people.' He snorted with indescribable disgust, flinging the paper to the ground. No, the Chinese do not take kindly to the role of younger brother to Soviet Russia, but I know that many of them feel that Russia has jumped from a very second-rate Power thirty years ago to the position of almost unchallenged predominance today, and China may do the same by a similar process.

Three years of Communism has brought China and Russia closer together so that they are welded into a single stronghold; but in the process China has become more subservient; she is now more in Russia's hands than she was two years ago. China is deeply committed in Korea, and there she is dependent entirely on Russian support. Economically, too, the same process is observable for she is now tied very closely commercially to the Soviet bloc. But let it be clearly understood that she is not a puppet and must not be thought of as a satellite State such as exists in Eastern Europe. The relationship is one of free co-operation, even if it is a little more one-sided than it was.

CHINA AND FORMOSA

To me one of the interesting phenomena about China these days is that as the country has settled firmly into the grip of the new tyranny (for tyranny it is), and section after section of the population realize with sobering effect what this means, the people's hopes and affections still do not turn toward Formosa. The pre-

revolution period of chaos, corruption and civil war is still fresh in people's minds for them not to want a return to that; the present dictatorship, with all its discipline and hardships, is preferable to another dreary decade of civil war. No, there is little evidence of heart-warming to the ex-ruler across the sea; no feeling of repentance, or any desire to be militarily liberated from Formosa or elsewhere. People are less happy than they were, but they do not look to Formosa to restore their happiness.

At the same time there is a tightening of the totalitarian control of the country, with a new unpleasant awareness of what this means; yet there is still strong satisfaction with many of the things that Communism has brought to China, and new goods are continually being shown in the nation's window. For example, the age of foreigners' privilege in China has completely gone; there are now few foreign business-men, or missionaries, left out of very many thousands. It may be an unreal victory, but it feels good. Also, resurgent China is still successfully challenging the enemy at the 38th parallel, and that means much to the Chinese. Improvements, too, in the country have not slackened through the energy required for Korea; China is a different country from what it was three years ago: roads, waterways, flood-control, irrigation canals, new railways and buildings, serious research into the country's mineral resources and their exploitation, reconstruction, and afforestation—all show a new and efficient administration.

In spite of hostilities there is little inflation, which is extraordinary after years of financial chaos. Indeed, China has even balanced her budget. Prices have come down, and effective price-control has been established over the whole country. Production in heavy and light industries, according to their own figures, exceeds the highest peaks of the past, and this may well be true. External trade is in greater volume than ever before. China has produced her first motor-bicycle, her first internal-combustion engine, and her first locomotive. Also, her notable expansion westwards, Hsin-chiang and Tibet, feels good to the ordinary Chinese.

From another angle, the Communist revolution has brought new justice to the sections of the population who were formerly oppressed and exploited. It might even be true to say that there is a new social justice in the land, for now individuals and classes are not under the uncontrolled authority of other individuals and classes . . . at least a feeling of social well-being is being engendered even though arbitrary autocracy has been replaced by an absolute, authoritarian State. All are equally controlled—that makes the difference.

So much of this (and more) is true, that it is quite possible for selected visitors to have their fares paid to Peking, be conducted through a part of the country and be genuinely impressed with the New China, extolling its achievements with sincere praise.

We need not be afraid of the truth; our Cause is good enough for us to face all the facts of the matter honestly and courageously. To paint Communist China, or indeed other areas behind the Iron Curtain, as an unrelieved black hell is simply incredible to the intelligent person, whilst I am convinced that it does our Cause great disservice. Let us *know* how Communism works out in a country such as China; if it has removed some of the poverty, squalor and oppression, then all strength to it! But let us face, too, the bitter and ruthless tyranny which has brought about these changes, and try to save the world from swallowing that to reach the same end. The Communist Government itself has now publicly stated that two million people have been liquidated during the three years—which is rather more

than we had estimated—and this is almost as many as the total number of Germans killed in the second World War. Was there no better way than that?

Confucius once said that something could be accomplished in a State within the space of three years. The Communist régime is three years old. The early violent revolution is a thing of the past; there is now no need to stamp out armed opposition for it no longer exists; the gruesome mass-trials and execution have ended; the countless suicide cases have stopped. Those of us who love China can at least hope that the violent blood-letting period is over, even though the control over the country is now one hundred per cent totalitarian.

If Confucius were alive today he would be incarcerated for his independent ideas—or probably he would have perished last year as a reactionary. The new rulers of China would do well to recall some of his words, spoken 2,500 years ago: 'The people may be made to follow a course without understanding the reasons why; but the higher type of man, though he may be imposed upon, cannot be completely hookwinked . . . he is a man and not a machine.'

R. ELLIOTT KENDALL

THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN 1453

IT IS just five-hundred years since the fall of Constantinople in 1453, one of the great land-marks in the history of the world. The Eastern or Byzantine Empire came to an end and gave place to the Ottoman Turks, whose leader Mohammed II sacked the city. This event may also be held to mark the final close of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the modern period, for the same century saw the introduction of printing into Europe and the discovery of America.

The following are facts which 'every schoolboy knows' about this subject:

(1) Stamboul or Istanbul is the present name of Constantinople; it comes from the Greek words '*eis ten polin*', literally 'into the city'.

(2) Constantinople was founded by the emperor Constantine about the year 330; its name of course means 'Constantine's city'.

(3) Diocletian (285-305) had recognized that the unwieldy Roman Empire had a western and an eastern half. In his reorganized administration there were two rulers in the west (an Augustus and a Cæsar) and two in the east. Constantine, however, ruled over the whole empire and moved its capital to the east. The city was known also as New Rome and like the old Rome was built on seven hills.

(4) He chose a site of strategic importance, previously named Byzantium (founded 660 B.C.); but Constantinople was virtually a new city, with a larger area, many new buildings, and an imported population.

(5) The western portion of the empire fell a prey to the Goths and Vandals in the fifth century—it was then that Roman soldiers were withdrawn from Britain to buttress the tottering western world. But the Eastern Empire, ruled from Constantinople, continued for another thousand years.

(6) By 1453 the dimensions of the Eastern (or Byzantine) Empire were very small. In fact the empire had virtually ended in 1204 when the Fourth Crusade turned aside from its objective and sacked this great Christian city. After a few years of Latin rule, a new Greek dynasty began, named the Palaeologi (1261-1453).

(7) The last of the Palaeologi was Constantine VI, who perished in 1453 defending his city. From that time it has ceased to be a Christian capital and has remained in the hands of the Turks.

(8) The Ottoman (Othman, Osmanli) Turks had arisen in the thirteenth century and rapidly gained supremacy in the Levant. Before them there were the Seljuk Turks. It was the Ottoman Sultan, Mohammed II, who finally laid siege to Constantinople, largely with the help of Christian soldiers.

(9) The Ottoman Empire, which soon stretched right down to Egypt, was ruled from Constantinople for centuries by the Sultans. It broke up as a result of the first World War, when Turkish rule became restricted to Turkey proper. Lawrence of Arabia helped to detach some of the Arabian territories from Turkish suzerainty.

(10) Kemal Ataturk, the dictator, replaced the Sultans, turned Turkey into a republic and moved its capital from Constantinople to Ankara (Angora). Mohammed II had turned the great Church of St Sophia into a Mohammedan mosque and had erected four minarets around it; Ataturk turned it into a museum.

Any one of these points could be expanded indefinitely; but in the limited space available something will be said about the 'Roman' Empire of the East, the rise of the Ottomans, and finally the siege itself and its sequel.

It was by a stroke of genius that Constantine chose this site for his capital. Excellently defended by water on three sides, it stood in a commanding position at the junction of Europe and Asia. Constantine beautified it with churches, public buildings, and the great Hippodrome. 'Whatever could adorn the dignity of a great capital, or contribute to the benefit or pleasure of its numerous inhabitants, was contained within the walls of Constantinople' (Gibbon).¹ For a thousand years this famous city was a centre of Christian civilization sending out its influence in every direction. It was here that important Church Councils were held. Here the Church of Christ the Holy Wisdom (Sophia) rang with the eloquent sermons of Chrysostom. Later this church was replaced by the magnificent cathedral of St Sophia, one of the most beautiful buildings in the world, erected by Justinian (527-65). Here the messengers of Vladimir came from Russia in 987 and what they saw in the cathedral so won their hearts that the conversion of their country to the Christian faith followed. Constantinople was not only a Christian centre; it represented too the culture of ancient Greece and it contained in a latent (or shall we say 'hibernating') form much of the heritage of the classical world, waiting as it were for the time when the West would be ready to receive it. According to some authorities there were more books within the walls of Constantinople than in all the rest of Europe. J. B. Bury says of the nine-hundred years from Constantine to 1204: 'Throughout the whole period . . . Constantinople was the first city in the world.'²

Long before the rise of the Ottoman power much of the Byzantine Empire had been wrenched away by the Arabs, and later by the Seljuk Turks whose advance from the steppes of Central Asia to Palestine had brought about the Crusades (the medieval substitute for overseas missions). Moreover, the Fourth Crusade had turned aside from its supposed objective and through the treachery of Venice, the great rival of Constantinople, brutally sacked this Christian city—one of the black crimes of history. Dandolo, the blind Doge of Venice who was over ninety years of age, was the real villain of the piece. Fires and looting destroyed much of the priceless treasure of the city, and some of the movable pieces were taken west by

the conquerors. The large bronze horses which stand today above the gateway of St Mark's at Venice came at this time from Constantinople. Historians maintain that this weakening of the Christian east made possible the later triumph of the Turk and handed over the Balkans to centuries of foreign rule.

From 1204 Constantinople was ruled for over fifty years by the Latins, and by violent measures the Greeks were compelled to acknowledge the Pope as their head. But this was not the way to achieve a permanent re-union of Christendom. In 1261 a Greek dynasty (that of the Palaeologi) was once more established in the city, the Pope's authority was renounced, and the hatred which had been aroused by the Latin period made the union of the eastern and western churches more difficult than ever. Only the Moslem gained by this division. The Palaeologi family provided the remaining emperors right on to Constantine VI who was reigning in 1453.

Meanwhile there had been important developments in Asia and we must turn now to the Turkish side of things. The Ottoman Turks emerged in Asia Minor in the thirteenth century from the midst of the Seljuk kingdom of Rum. The Seljuks had come from Turkestan in the eleventh century and in addition to their other conquests (including the capture of Jerusalem in 1076, the event which touched off the Crusades) they occupied most of Asia Minor, leaving only the western area and a northern region along the Black Sea coast to the Byzantine Empire. This Seljuk kingdom of Rum later became divided among separate emirs, and it was one of these who founded the Ottoman dynasty. Othman (b. 1258), who gave the dynasty his name, absorbed the emirates of Asia Minor and he was followed by his son Orchan in 1326. Orchan extended his father's conquests but he is remembered mainly because of his institution of the Janissaries (*Yeni Tcheri* or new troops). The peoples conquered by Islam always had to choose either the Koran or tribute, this had been the alternative for centuries. But Orchan decreed that the tribute need not be in money or goods; eight-year-old boys would be taken instead. Hundreds of such boys were extorted from Christian villages by the Turks who trained them with great care and turned them into Moslems. Some were drafted into civil administration and others into the army. The latter were the Janissaries and for two centuries they were unsurpassed as soldiers. The victories of Islam were thus secured by means of Christian children.³

The Ottomans grew in strength under succeeding sultans and became more and more menacing. By the beginning of the fifteenth century their empire stretched from the Euphrates to the Danube and Constantinople was practically isolated. The Sultan Bayezid began a siege of the city in 1399 which would undoubtedly have succeeded but for the fact that danger from another direction drew the Turks back to defend their Asiatic kingdom. Timur (known sometimes as Tamerlane, and to Marlowe as Tamburlaine), the Tartar from Samarkand, after

*Threatening the world with high astounding terms
And scourging kingdoms with his conquering sword*

in Russia, Tartary, Persia, and India, had turned his attention to the growing Ottoman Empire and invaded Asia Minor. This monster is described by H. A. L. Fisher as 'an old white-haired cripple . . . an intellectual specialist in chess, theology, and conquest, and perhaps the greatest artist in destruction in the savage annals of mankind'.⁴ The Turks suffered a shattering defeat at his hands in 1402 and for a

time it seemed that the battle of Angora had put a decisive end to Ottoman power. Bayezid was captured by Timur and never regained his liberty; it was commonly believed that he was kept in an iron cage and thus became a by-word to illustrate the mutability of human fortune.

The Ottomans, however, recovered and fifty years later made their last and successful attempt on Constantinople. The Sultan at this time was Mohammed II, a young man in his early twenties. He advanced against the city with an army of 150,000 and blockaded it by sea and land. It was defended by an army of about 8,000, reinforced by a much smaller contingent brought in by John Justiniani, a Genoese soldier. The siege began on 7th April. The result was inevitable and after some weeks of resistance the Janissaries finally poured through an opening where Turkish cannon had destroyed a portion of the wall. The last emperor of the Eastern Empire, Constantine VI, died defending his capital. It was 29th May, and from that time Constantinople has been and still is under Turkish rule.

Gibbon gives a graphic description of Mohammed II exploring his prize. 'Attended by his vizirs, bashaws, and guards . . . the conqueror gazed with satisfaction and wonder on the strange though splendid appearance of the domes and palaces, so dissimilar from the style of Oriental architecture.' In the Hippodrome he shattered with his iron mace the under-jaw of one of three bronze serpents which had been brought a thousand years before from Delphi, where they had supported the golden tripod of Apollo. He then came to the main door of the great church of St Sophia. 'By his command the metropolis of the Eastern church was transformed into a mosque; the rich and portable instruments of superstition had been removed; the crosses were thrown down; and the walls, which were covered with images and mosaics, were washed and purified and restored to a state of naked simplicity.' (Bury points out in a footnote that this means 'covered with whitewash'!)

On the same day, or on the ensuing Friday, the *muezzin* or crier ascended the most lofty turret, and proclaimed the *ezan*, or public invitation, in the name of God and his prophet; the imam preached; and Mahomet the Second performed the *namaz* of prayer and thanksgiving on the great altar, where the Christian mysteries had so lately been celebrated before the last of the Cæsars. From St Sophia he proceeded to the august but desolate mansion of a hundred successors of the great Constantine; but which, in a few hours, had been stripped of the pomp of royalty. A melancholy reflection on the vicissitudes of human greatness forced itself on his mind; and he repeated an elegant distich of Persian poetry: 'The spider has wove his web in the imperial palace; and the owl hath sung her watch-song on the towers of Afrasiab.'

He allowed the Christians who remained to follow their religion and recognized the Patriarch as their head. In the next thirty years he reduced to his rule more European territory and in 1480 captured Otranto in Italy. His death soon after resulted in the recall of the garrison stationed there; otherwise old Rome might have shared the fate of new Rome. Later Turkish conquerors, Selim and Suleyman the Magnificent, extended still farther the Ottoman rule, until at length it stretched from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf, and from the Crimea to Cairo.

A few final points of varying importance may be mentioned briefly. It is only since 1453 that the Crescent has been a Turkish sign. At a famous siege of Byzantium in 340 B.C. the citizens attributed their escape from Philip (father of Alexander the Great) to their goddess, Hecate, and took her symbol, the crescent moon, for

their emblem. 'The symbol has had a curious history, pagan down to Constantine, and after him Christian till the Turks took the city in 1453, and still to be seen as a Turkish device.' The crescent remained on Christian churches for the sake of old memories and in the faith that (as a Christian prophet wrote) 'the South wind will some day cease blowing'.⁴

Soon after the fall of Constantinople, Russia came to regard herself as the new protector of the Orthodox faith. Ivan III, grand duke of Muscovy, married a Byzantine princess, the niece of Constantine VI, in 1467; and their grandson Ivan the Terrible took to himself the title of Tsar (= Czar = Cæsar). The Tsars were thus the successors of the Byzantine emperors and Moscow was known as the third Rome.⁵ For centuries Russia longed to re-capture Constantinople from Turkish hands; and if today the Turks are apprehensive of Russian intentions, though new motives have supervened, this situation is not unrelated to 1453 and all that.

The world's debate still continues and it will not ultimately be settled by military exploits. The following words of Dean R. W. Church⁶ may help us as we ponder this watershed of history:

On the bronze gates of St Sophia at Constantinople may still be seen—at least it might be seen some years ago—the words placed there by its Christian builder, and left there by the scornful ignorance or indifference of the Ottomans—I.X. NIKA, Jesus Christ conquers. It is the expression of that unshaken assurance which in the lowest depths of humiliation has never left the Christian races of the East, that sooner or later theirs is the winning cause.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

¹ *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (J. B. Bury's illustrated edition), II.163.

² Article on 'Roman Empire (Later)' in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

³ R. Lodge, *The Close of the Middle Ages*, p.500.

⁴ *A History of Europe*, p.405.

⁵ Bury adds that according to one account 'he stooped down at the threshold of the church, took some earth, and scattered it on his head, in token of humiliation to God' (VII.207).

⁶ T. R. Glover, *The Ancient World*, Ch. 7 (Section E). See also article 'Flag' in *Ency. Brit.* Another account maintains that the Crescent was the device of Orchan's Janissaries (cf. *Ency. Brit.*, Article 'Crescent'). On either showing it is an anachronism to speak of the Crescent in connexion with the Crusades.

⁷ cf. Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect.X; and Article 'Russia' in *Ency. Brit.*

⁸ *The Influence of Christianity upon National Character*. Quoted in H. B. Workman's *Church of the West in the Middle Ages*, II.80.

COMMUNISM: THE NEW ISLAM

THE tendency to seek historical parallels in the troubled situation of the world today is, one supposes, irresistible and inevitable. Not the weightiest of warnings even against the pitfalls that lie in such a quest seem to exercise the least restraint. A century of scientific historical studies has bred a habit of historical comparisons which has now become ingrained.

This habit is not in itself reprehensible, since it is surely impossible to sever the present from the past. This is what the complete rejection of historical comparison would mean. It would imply that the past has no significance for the present. This is the easy, baseless belief that is embodied in the modern contempt for tradition, in the worship of a progress without roots. In our time, we seem to think that an experience which has been lived is finished, that our deeds do not travel with us from afar, and what we have been does not make us what we are. And, of course, a past without dynamic becomes meaningless; it can teach us nothing. It thus becomes senseless to draw parallels with a past from which nothing is to be learnt.

But the past is not done with. It is never finished. The past continues to be dynamic. Tradition is always vital however we may despise it. Therefore, historical comparison is a legitimate intellectual activity. What is reprehensible is not historical comparison *per se* but exaggerated historical comparison in which salient, essential facts are minimized or distorted. What we must beware of is comparison which subjects history through distortion to contemporary self-interest in some form or other. To reject all historical comparison because specific comparisons happen to be unsound savours too much of throwing out the baby with the bath-water.

These considerations are relevant to comparisons which are being increasingly drawn between Communism and social and political movements in the past—to one comparison in particular, which may so easily lead us astray. Wandering astray where Communism is concerned is a luxury which Western civilization can no longer afford. Any historical parallels with contemporary Communism must therefore be thoroughly tested at every point.

I

In a good deal of current writing about Communism, there is a danger that one historical comparison in particular may very seriously lead us astray. It is the comparison between the advance of Communism in Europe and the barbarian invasions of the Roman Empire. It is most plausible, but it is also pernicious, because it effectively obscures the precise point which makes Communism today the menace that it is. Let me state briefly the parallel usually made between the Western advance of Communism today and the barbarian invasions of Rome in the fifth and sixth centuries.

The essential, substantial point which this parallel seeks to establish is the destruction of Roman Civilization by the invading barbarian and the threatened destruction of Western civilization by Communism today. Roman civilization was already in process of disintegrating when the barbarians invaded and completed the process. Under their violent hammer-blows, Rome was finally destroyed. The schools, the libraries, the country villas as centres of culture, the administrative apparatus and the rest of the institutions of civilization collapsed, and there followed the five hundred years of the Dark Ages.

Today—to continue the parallel—Western civilization is also disintegrating. This is the ominous fact which makes its destruction by the new barbarians so easy. They too are heralds of a destroying end. This is the picture drawn by Mr Arthur Koestler in his latest novel, *The Age of Longing*, in which he refers to the grim advance of Communism as 'the shadow of Neanderthal man'. Under his jackboot, the institutions and values of Western civilization will be finally dissipated. The new barbarians, like the old, will simply apply the finishing touches.

This, in brief, is the historical comparison which has now become almost a fashion among anti-Communists. By dint of frequent repetition, it is becoming a dogma. The modern art of advertising has so conditioned the mind of our generation, that it tends to believe anything if it is repeated often enough. A subtle touch of verisimilitude is added to the parallel by a clever distinction. Historical parallels can be made more convincing if a slight divergence be added! So it is pointed out that the ancient barbarian was bred outside the frontiers of Rome, whilst the modern barbarian has been bred within Europe and by Europe itself. Since Niebuhr first made this brilliant distinction,¹ it has become current coin among philosophers of history! Surely a parallel with such a difference(!) must be true. But it is not. If the modern Communist has an ancient predecessor, he certainly is not the invading barbarian of old. The theory does not fit the facts, and facts, as Lenin once observed, are stubborn things.

To begin with, the ancient barbarian did not destroy Roman civilization. He merely *diminished* it.² Great as was the calamity wrought by the barbarian, it did not, however, amount to destruction. The influx of 'the golden horde' into the urban centres of Roman Civilization was bound, of course, to result in a fearful reduction of civilized functions. What use could adult savages make of academies and schools? What purpose could a highly complicated administrative State apparatus serve in the hands of untutored savages? The State, as a civilized and civilizing power, did collapse in the West. Functions and institutions fell from its palsied hands. But they were picked up by the Church, which rescued Roman Civilization, though damaged and marred. Nevertheless, it was rescued and preserved *as a going concern*. The Church in the West assumed the burden of civilization which the Roman State abandoned. The Church undertook the tremendous historical responsibility of civilizing the barbarian, which she did to such good purpose that, in such a brief span as five centuries, a new Gothic civilization arose, whose glories have not yet been excelled—no, not even by the chromium-plated achievements of Western Science.

We can now appreciate a little better the delusion which is fostered by the parallel between Communism and the barbarian invasions, namely, that the new barbarian, if he does conquer Europe, can in time, like the old barbarian, be Westernized, Europeanized, civilized. The triumph of Communism would, of course, be a calamity, a very great calamity, but not decisive, because, in due course, he could be conquered by the civilization—in time—as the successive invaders of China were absorbed. After all, the ancient barbarian was civilized. Why not the modern barbarian too?

This is the argument of people who are already doubtful whether Western Civilization can be preserved. It is a re-furbishing of the discredited policy of appeasement. It is romanticism in a panic. If Europe cannot summon the moral strength and determination to save itself *now*, whence will it acquire the will and

power for the much greater task of recreating itself? It is an argument which ignores historical facts, but even more does it ignore present realities, above all the reality of the power which modern science places in the hands of the police-state (a) for the complete crushing of opposition and (b) for the satanic conditioning of mind and soul. It is an argument which believes that cure is easier than prevention. It is an argument which obscures the fact that disintegration of the will to defend Europe is already far advanced. Reasons are nearly always the product of will. In this case, they are the product of the absence of will.

II

The analogy between Communism and ancient barbarianism breaks down on one elementary but vital point: *the Communist is not a barbarian*. On the contrary, he is civilized—in the sense that he is possessed of a culture.

Culture is exactly what the invading barbarian lacked. He had tribal custom, usages, folk lore, even tradition. But he had no culture in the sense of a self-consciously acquired *corpus* of belief, philosophy, achievement. He had no cultural dynamic to oppose to the civilized tradition of the conquered. That is one reason why the barbarian, in due course, was assimilated to the civilization of Rome which was re-shaped by Christianity. The barbarian was a psychological and social vacuum. And history no less than nature abhors a vacuum. Painfully and laboriously, in a process stretching over centuries, the barbarian acquired the civilization of his victims, because he had no culture of his own to oppose to it. Unconscious folk lore will always be overcome by conscious culture.

The description of the Communist as a barbarian completely misses the significance of the cultural heritage. Communist brutality and cruelty must not blind us to the very important fact that he inherits a whole culture. Lenin himself made this point clear. 'Marxism is the system of the views and teachings of Marx. Marx was the genius who continued and completed the three chief ideological currents of the nineteenth century, represented respectively by the three most advanced countries of humanity: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines.'³

This threefold cultural tradition was not, as Lenin contended, European culture at its best. It was not Western Christian culture, but the post-Renaissance, secular corruption of that culture. It was, nevertheless, a *culture*, and this fact vastly distinguishes the modern Communist from the ancient barbarian. It settles one point beyond any possibility of doubt. The modern Communist is not a psychological, social vacuum. His mentality is already filled and conditioned by a very definite cultural pattern, of which the determining element is Hegel who, in spite of everything said by Edward Caird, is not a Christian philosopher. Communism inherited the tradition of secular Humanism and has carried it to its logical conclusion. The Communist stands, therefore, over against Western Christian Europe with a dynamic, opposing culture of his own. And this fact suggests a far more feasible historical parallel than that of the barbarian.

The Barbarian invasions of the Empire in the fifth century were followed by the Saracen invasions of Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries. The Mohammedan, fortunately, only gained a temporary foothold in Provence, but a firmer establishment in Spain. Had he succeeded in conquering Charles Martel at the

Battle of Tours (A.D. 732), he would probably have won dominion over the whole of Europe, and, as Gibbon said, the result would have been that the Koran, not the Bible, would have been the object of study at Oxford. But Spain became a Mohammedan province for centuries, from which a significant conclusion emerges. *It was semi-Christian Spain that was assimilated to a new alien Arabic civilization.* It was the Mohammedan who did the assimilating, and the conquered Spaniard who underwent assimilation. In other words, European civilization in Spain was destroyed. It was not merely diminished, however, reduced to a lower level, but destroyed. It gave way to an entirely different civilization. What the barbarian never could have done because of his lack of a culture, the Mohammedan with his dynamic culture succeeded in doing. He imposed his own civilization on the conquered. He displaced Christ with Mohammed.

The determining principle of the Mohammedan achievement in Spain was an intense, passionate dogma—'There is one God and His name is Allah, and Mohammed is His Prophet'. There were no vacant spaces in the soul and mind of this conqueror, waiting to be filled by the superior civilization of the defeated. The vacant spaces, if any, were in the souls of the Spaniards. The Mohammedan, not the Teutonic barbarian, was the destroyer of Europe.

If, therefore, we are seeking a historical analogy to contemporary Communism, we are far more likely to find it in the Mohammedan invasions than in the earlier barbarian invasions. Islam had a culture and a creed. *So has Communism.* Islam proceeded to root out Christian civilization where it had the power to do so. *So does Communism.* The Communists do not subscribe to the idea that Christianity is effete. They look upon the Church, in which Christianity is embodied, as their greatest enemy. And they are right, of course. In China, Poland, Hungary, wherever its dominion, Communism subjects the Church to continuous and accumulating attack. Communism is not the new barbarianism; it is the new Islam, an armed doctrine, propaganda at the end of a gun.

Communism has a core of cast-iron dogma. 'Without a theory', said Lenin, 'there can be no revolution.' This is why the hope that the triumph of Communism can be followed by Christianization is such a childish dream. Communists in power become absolutely ruthless in imposing their dogma by force. If that were the whole story, the resulting historical situation would be by no means hopeless. But it is not. Islam in Spain, for all its passion and dogmatism, showed a surprising degree of tolerance, which prevented the destruction of European civilization from ever becoming absolute. But in Communism there is not the shadow of a vestige of tolerance. It is the absolute North Pole of intolerance. Its use of force to impose its dogma is not restrained by the faintest trace of conscience. What is even more sinister, it supplements its use of conscienceless compulsion by what Communists call 'Social Engineering'. It is this above all which very probably ensures that its conquest of Europe would mean the complete destruction of Western civilization, if that conquest were ever attained. Then indeed *Das Kapital* would be the Oxford curriculum.

'Social Engineering' treats the soul of man as raw material, to be moulded to the pattern ordained by the dictatorship. By all the devices which a sinister and blinded science has made available to the wielders of power, the minds of children would be corrupted and perverted and everything that we have hitherto understood by the term 'Western Civilization' would indeed be destroyed utterly. The new Islam

would leave nothing to chance. As Dostoevsky once put it, it would destroy genius in the cradle.⁴

III

The satanic prospect of a triumphant Communism ought to inspire a fanatic, sleepless, and intelligent determination that such a prospect shall never be realized. It ought to cleanse our hearts and minds of any romantic notions about re-Westernizing Communism. Resistance to Communism unto death should be the sacred mission of all decent and humane people. Here is the Grand Moral Crusade of our era surely.

But the determination, as I have hinted, must be intelligent, which means, at least, a realistic appraisal of what Communism is and of the methods it employs to achieve its ends. It is this last consideration which is so woefully inadequate.

Paradoxical though it may appear, it is, nevertheless, true to say that in Communism, force is only secondary. Communism uses force mainly to secure the right conditions to organize its propaganda, one of which is, of course, the silencing of all competing ideas. Force is a means to persuasion in the long run. Communism looks upon its dogma of Dialectical Materialism as its supreme asset and possession. In the final analysis, dogma can be overcome only by another, and different dogma. The final defeat of Communism depends more than aught else upon the common realization of this fact.

Appreciation of this fact is gravely prejudiced by well-meaning idealists who seek to diminish and decry the need for armed preparation. How often are we told, especially by clerics, that we cannot overcome Communism by armed force. You cannot overcome any ism whatever by armed force alone. But a statement so general is meaningless, and too abstract for human nature's daily use. Only too often, however, this meaningless abstraction is used to hypnotize the unwary into the belief that armaments should be neglected. In our present situation that would be fatal. Though it is true, as Christ affirmed, that man shall not live by bread alone, it is no less true that without bread man cannot live at all. So it is true that Western civilization cannot be secured by arms alone, yet without arms it cannot be secured anyhow, especially in the present disbalance between Russia and the West. The insistence upon the need of spiritual factors in the struggle against Communism ought *never* to be presented as an *alternative* to armed force, but always as a *supplement*. Rather the reverse—armed might as the complement to spiritual dogma.

Armaments guarantee us the time that we need to enable spiritual factors to do their work. If the time so purchased is not utilized to that end, then indeed armaments will fail us in the end. The only final security against Communism lies in the winning of the minds of men for certain beliefs, principles, and values. Armaments will protect us from Communist suppression whilst we pursue this task of spiritual and moral conviction.

One of the great ironies of our era has been the Communist exploitation of a principle which the Church went so far to neglect.⁵ This principle is that dogma is of the first importance. There is no such thing as a creedless Communism. But there has been, and still is, such a thing as a creedless Christianity, which is one of the abortions of post-Renaissance secular Humanism. Against a 'creedful' Communism, creedless Christianity stands absolutely no chance whatever of survival. The first condition to be satisfied in the long-distance strategy of the

crusade against Communism is the realization that Christian dogma is of fundamental importance. Without it we cannot prevent the further advance of Communism, to say nothing whatever about the *equally important* task of recovering Eastern Europe for Western civilization. Christian dogma is the most powerful weapon in the armoury of the West in the struggle against Communism. And in the inculcation of the present generation with Christian dogma, the Church of England and the Free Churches must display much more imagination and vigour than they seem to do at the moment.

The relevant significance of Christian dogma for our age is the sanction it provides for the Western idea of man—that man is an end, not a means or an instrument in the game of power politics. Humanism, together with its first cousin, a Christianity without creed, has proved utterly impotent to preserve this idea of man. Without its root in the doctrine of the divine creation of man, the Western idea of the uniqueness of man withers away, and so makes the task of dictatorship easy. It is a profound paradox that, in the long run, Western civilization can be secured only by a faith (the Christian faith) whose prime concern is not civilization, but the salvation of souls, for an order transcending all secular civilizations. But though a paradox, it is the truth.

Islam, wherever it came to power, as in Spain, destroyed Europe by means of its culture and dogma. The new Islam, Communism, is doing the same thing in Eastern Europe and wherever it gains power. Unless we supplement our armaments with a dogmatically founded Faith, this new Islam will most surely destroy us all.

D. R. DAVIES

¹ Vide *Reflection on the End of an Era* (Scribners, New York 1934).

² Vide *Charlemagne and Mohammed*, By Henri Pirenne (Allen & Unwin, 1940).

³ *The Selected Works* (Moscow 1939), Vol. XI, p. 13.

⁴ *The Possessed* (Everyman Edition), Vol. II, p. 69.

⁵ That is to say, the Protestant Churches. The Roman Church has always insisted that dogma was of prime importance.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF NEIGHBOURLINESS

'Do you see yonder shining light?'

'I think I do.'

'Keep that light in your eye. Go up directly thereto.'

Pilgrim's Progress

'WISE thinkers do homage to good fellow-thinkers,' says Robert Bridges in *The Testament of Beauty*. He pays that homage liberally, and notably to Plato and Aristotle; but though Neoplatonism is now being rediscovered as an 'essential last chapter' in Greek philosophy, he does not name Plotinus. This article tries to bring together Bridges and Plotinus as good fellow-thinkers (though nearly seventeen centuries apart); and to suggest that there is no 'last chapter' to this philosophy of practical idealism, so long as thought is linked with action, and the torch handed on by life-service as well as by thought.

Today this practical idealism is doubly needed, to rescue philosophy from the charge of escapism, and to make its guiding tenets available both to scientists and to the common man. The ultra-specialization of modern science, and the abstract phraseology of philosophy, make this fellow-thinking increasingly difficult.

Yet the *simplicity* of the greatest thinkers in their greatest moments links them not only with each other but with their less thoughtful fellow-mortals. Because it is 'the simplicity of plenitude, not emptiness', the latter cannot for long keep company with their mountain-guides. The result is prolonged or recurrent error for the many, and loneliness for the mountain-guides, even when, like Plotinus and Bridges, they are the most social-minded of their kind. Plotinus's much-quoted description of the last stages of the spiritual ascent—'Alone to the Alone'—deters while it fascinates, like a mountain peak. Bridges, describing the ardent spirit of the young climber, setting out at dawn 'to scale precipices where no foot clomb afore', is also describing the spiritual quest for utmost truth and beauty. In the first lines of *The Testament*, written 'late in my long journey', he tells us that he found 'the company few', just because he had climbed to a point whence his own home far below was small and dim, like 'a faded thought'. It was his mounting thought, still young in its expanding vision, that brought him loneliness. Yet for him, as for Plotinus, all that travail of thought was like the work of some humane, disinterested surveyor, mapping out 'a pathway of happiness' for the human race. Just because, from their high perspective they put us, humans, in our proper, humble place in a universe of beauty, and ask us to find more worth and interest in that universe than in ourselves, their guidance is unacceptable to 'the herd'. If only they would deal with less, they would appeal to more. They are (like the impartial spectator of mass-emotion) 'incomprehensible because comprehending'.

What could be a 'simpler' theme than Unity—the goal of philosophy and science alike? And what more baffling to the intellect? Are we any nearer the solution of 'the One and the Many' than was Socrates when he handed on the torch to Plato? Science, by telescope and microscope, has made the Many inconceivably manifold, expanding the universe, splitting and resplitting even to the atom which the Greeks named indivisible, and thereby goading philosophy to a renewed pursuit of the One. Both Plotinus and Bridges end their long quest in the unity of mysticism, and the identification (not the absorption) of the individual with the whole. 'This

Individualism is man's true socialism,' culminating in 'One Eternal, in the love of Beauty and in the selfhood of Love.'

That goal is timeless. Within the time-process unity means *continuity*. There are many levels, but no sheer breaks in the ascent. Self persists throughout, sometimes its own arch-enemy, seeking to be stationary or retrograde, but also the divine spur to its own transformation through the not-self, till it reaches the One. Plotinus, though often more oriental than Greek in his demand for self-merging, is yet careful to preserve self-identity. Bridges, in his last three words, defines Love (now his chosen name for the ultimate Reality) as selfhood. Both reach their goal by the Platonic ladder of Beauty, whereby the self continually renews its life by losing it. And both, while requiring us to discard each lower rung of the ladder as we climb, yet will have us rejoice in every transient experience of beauty, reaching the spiritual through the physical. The passages in the *Enneads* in praise of the beauty of earth and sea and sky and stars, deliberately written against the Gnostics because of their contempt for the material universe, find their counterpart in the Testament, and notably in the Franciscan hymn of praise in the first book. Reverent joy in the beauty of the world is, for both, a part of their great Theodicy. (E. R. Dodds surely under-rates this feature of the *Enneads*, almost classing Plotinus with the Gnostics in this respect, though Plotinus definitely disowns them.)

For the *Enneads*, like *The Testament of Beauty*, are steeped in religious faith. Plotinus's antagonism to Christianity is explicable by the low standards of Christian observance among his contemporaries of the third century. What he saw there had more of magic and superstition than of pure faith and high morality. Hence his disparagement of formal prayer, though not of prayer that is genuine. He himself, when approaching some climax of difficult thought, invokes God's help. He would have concurred with Bridges' censure of ecclesiastics 'chanting their clerkly creed to the high-echoing stones of their hand-built temple' while 'Christ yet walketh the earth, and talketh still'. But Bridges is at great pains to restore prayer to its rightful place, not only in ethics, psychology, and practical life, but also in metaphysics, 'among the causes of determined flux', i.e. as influencing not only the spirit of the worshipper, but the objective course of events. Neoplatonism, 'a religion without sacraments or sacred books or a church or a priesthood' (Dodds),¹ could not fail to win his sympathy, even though he saw more clearly than Plotinus the need of 'the herd' for these external helps. He blames philosophy, which

*in dread of superstition gave religion away
to priests and monks, who rich in their monopoly
furbish and trim the old idols, that they dare not break,
for fear of the folk and need of good disciplin.*

iv.1141

His criticism of formalists is combined with a generous tolerance for all sincere devotion—Christian, Buddhist, Moslem—extended even to the intolerant Manichees, who, like the Gnostics, denounced as evil what God pronounced good, and by their sullen creed insulted earth and heaven. Though Plotinus finds it as hard to say a good word for the Gnostics as Bridges for the Manichees, both have a Quaker-like faith in 'that of God in everyman', which, while uniting him with the whole, makes him an individual.

Though they cannot solve the mystery of *individuality*, Bridges and Plotinus throw searching light upon it. They belong to the metaphysical school of Bradley and Bosanquet, for whom, ultimately, there is only one Individual, all lesser selves being merged in not-self. For Ethics and Politics, they are champions of individuality in the other sense, asserting the value of the human unit against mass-methods and aggregates. (In this also they are in accord with Bradley and Bosanquet.) 'The high goal of our endeavour', says Bridges, 'is individual attainment, individual worth.' As to 'the herd', the record of the race up to 1930 had for him a mournful monotony, an ebb and flow in which progress is hard to discern. It was easier for Plotinus than for Bridges to ignore past happenings as relatively unreal, and therefore unimportant. There was less history to deal with, and less scientific material for dealing with it. For Bridges, there was a longer history, and a startling new increase of archaeological knowledge. Few passages in *The Testament* are more poignant and vivid than the description (almost first-hand) of the recent researches at Ur. Linking this with other chapters of our human story he draws the sorrowful conclusion that 'in every age and nation the same confusion is found'. 'The doings of clowns and kings are a pitiful tale.' He shares with Plotinus the conviction that time and place are irrelevant, but, more pessimistically, seems to deny racial progress. Though there have been, and still may be, ages of faith, and seasons of renaissance, when 'Nature herself danceth in her blossoming time midst the flowers of her setting', is not racial decay equally inevitable? If he had lived through our latest chapter, would he have cancelled his own last pages, or could he still bequeath to us their indomitable faith? If he could, it would be partly because for him the dark story of the race is continually redeemed by 'individual attainment, individual worth', which, however small in bulk, conquers by quality, breaks through the time-process, and is valid eternally. Cervantes and Don Quixote redeem a decadent Spain. 'One good Bishop and one noble King' illumine medieval gloom. The spiritual beauty of Greece, betrayed by 'love of fleshly prowess' and 'molten into the great stiffening alloy of Rome', was redeemed 'when Jesus came in his gentleness with his divine compassion and great Gospel of Peace'. And 'Christ's company still holdeth together on the strength of His promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world".'

Thus does Bridges give Christian expression to the worth of the individual and to the truth of Divine Immanence—a truth which Plotinus held no less firmly, Immanence completing Emanation. In both writers we find the same twofold aim—to give a rational account of the Reality underlying experience; and to place the individual in direct contact with this reality' (Dodds). And in both the second aim is the stronger. But for Bridges the contact with Reality is consistently made personal, while for Plotinus it is more often—not always—an abstract relationship. And though Bridges holds most firmly a theory of Ideas which 'from soul to soul pass freely', he delights to clothe the doctrine in its Christian form. That free converse of Ideas is, or can be, that 'Communion of Saints' which 'foldeth the sheep in pastures of eternal life'. He is, in J. A. Stewart's phrase, 'a personal Platonist'. For the individual he does hold out conditional hope of immortality—of unlimited progress till the topmost rung of the ladder is reached, and the ladder turns into a ring, and the lost self is found in God. This is the goal—not automatically attained, but only by a series of hard choices and the willed 'co-ordination of faculties', without which 'this mind perisheth with this body'.

Since the problem of evil lies in the whole background of the *Enneads* and *The Testament*, a brief summary must be attempted of the contributions made to it by Plotinus and Bridges. For both, evil is less real than good and therefore the teaching of both is optimistic. The dualism of Gnostics and Manichees is firmly ruled out. Plotinus, describing evil as the negation of good, and in its last degree utterly unreal, offers us a solution which (as Dean Inge and Professor Dodds maintain) may satisfy logic, but does violence to our experience. We know evil as something much worse than zero, and much more real. Bridges deals more humanly with our human situation—the terrors of childhood, the uncharted jungle of uncivilized man, the ‘eyeless sorrows’, the cruelties of intolerant religions, the shame of war. As a practical idealist he labours long and hard with the giant problem of this century, the problem of war, devoting much of Book II to this distortion of selfhood. The long argument, after what seems the inevitable vote of censure, carried unanimously by common sense, ethics, history, science, metaphysics and religion, ends on a note of perplexity.

*War faln from savagery to fratricide,
from a trumpeting vainglory to a crying shame,
stalketh now with blasting curse branded on its brow.*

I.734

*Needless taking of life putteth Reason to shame,
and men so startle at bloodshed that all homicide
may to a purist seem mortal pollution of soul;
a mystical horror of it may rule in him so strong,
that rather than be slayer he would himself be slain:
But fatherhood dispenseth with this vain taboo:
the duty of mightiness is to protect the weak;
and since slackness in duty is unto noble minds
a greater shame and blame than any chance offence
ensuing on right conduct, this hath my assent,—
that where ther is any savagery ther wil be war:
the warrior therefore needeth no apology.*

II.556

Bridges was writing between the two world wars, and before the use of atomic weapons. His darkest forebodings did not foresee Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He could not have dismissed these deliberate deeds as ‘any chance offence ensuing on right conduct’, nor claimed that they protected the weak.

Nor is the second passage consistent with the first and with his own metaphysical basis of ethics. If man, like God, is ‘self-express’d in not-self, without which no self were’ (IV.1441), war is both ‘fratricide’ and suicide. The self I slay is not only my neighbour, not only my brother, but myself. That ‘mystical horror’ is not a ‘vain taboo’. It carries the authority of Intuition, above that of Reason, which, pre-eminently in regard to war, has been found impotent. This is the central theme of Unity, struggling to be heard through all the din of discord. If Bridges were with us now, would he not renew with even greater intensity his appeal to scientists and philosophers, as fellow-thinkers, to make their thinking ‘wise’ not only through ultimate consistency but by practical application?

For, if we have desecrated the goal of Unity, our proper, practical concern is with the process—the day by day approach to the shining light. For this, Plotinus and Bridges hand on to us with conviction the Platonic counsels. Asceticism, freely chosen as by an athlete, self-denial for the sake of the true self—these are indispensable safeguards against the many-headed hydra. Yet they themselves may be dangerous. Bridges tells us of his own progress, from fear of self-indulgence to a stage when he was 'fearful of that fear'. Plotinus gives ruthless counsel to the novice aspiring to mystic union with the One: 'Let all else go!' Yet he warns us that ὕβρις (hybris) spiritual pride, or self-assertion even of the higher self, is at least as much responsible for the fall of man as is ὕλη (hylē), our bodily share in matter. In both writers, the bias of temperament is clearly on the side of ascetic discipline. They reject metaphysical dualism, but assert ethical dualism—an 'ethic cut sharply atwain', separating hedonists from those who have learnt that the pathway of happiness lies through duty, as surely as through beauty. Teachers of this true ethic are 'prophets of God'.

But all this is self-centred, however exalted the self, even when it has, in the Plotinian scheme, discarded not only its bodily entanglement with matter, but the lower phases of Soul, and is moving through the sphere of Spirit to its home. That final loss of self, which is its home-coming in the One, can only be described by Bridges and Plotinus on the plane of ecstasy. 'He who has seen it, knows', but tell it he cannot. He can only give us sign-posts and clues, and this Bridges does.

Starting from instinct, not ecstasy, he finds the clue in the mother-love of the 'young black ouzel' which he is watching as he writes. The nest-building bird, with its 'pother' of 'rubbishy straw', is learning, and teaching, the true ethic, the ethic of altruism. Throughout nature, mother-love is fulfilling the moral law which is also the natural law—self-realization through self-sacrifice. The IS and the OUGHT are being reconciled. It is in mother-love rather than in the love of golden boys and girls (unless sublimated as by Dante and Beatrice) that Bridges finds the plainest clue to the universal law of altruism, and the mystery of self-in-not-self. Reverting to Plato's parable of the two horses, he calls them Selfhood and Breed, and unlike Plato, pronounces them both good, though both require life-long discipline. Though the whole of Book III of *The Testament* is assigned to 'Breed', the 'younger and more mettlesome' horse, the main tenor of the argument is to disparage its exaggerated claims to our attention, and to sum them up as racial selfhood. 'Breed is to the race as selfhood to the individual.'

In Book IV, the clue to the universal plan is found in friendship. To this high theme the long argument leads us, culminating, through Christian friendship, in a mystical, but still personal, universal Love. Perhaps we are meant to consider mother-love as the most perfect form of human friendship, consisting 'in loving rather than in being loved', the child being rather the possessor than the possession. But for Bridges as for Aristotle the essence of all friendship is the finding in one's friend one's own better self. And Bridges goes farther, and gravely asserts what Aristotle denied ('because of their unlimited disparity') the reciprocal friendship of man and God.

It is just here that Plotinus, following Aristotle, seems most at variance with Bridges, and his presentation of the Christian faith. Plotinus says plainly that the need of the self for the One is not reciprocal. The One needs nothing and no one. But, in his similes at least, he is inconsistent with himself, and speaks of the One

as a Father seeking, or at least welcoming, the prodigal son or daughter. Is he not, as, like Socrates he professes to be, still a seeker, and never a dogmatist? It is not only the uncertain Greek text of the *Enneads*, and the confusion of lecture-notes which Porphyry had to set in order, but his own unsatisfied thought which hovers between personal and impersonal, between $\delta \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ (God) and $\tau\acute{o} \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ (the divine), in the discussion of the One, and sometimes would answer Aristotle's $\kappa\iota\nu\epsilon\iota \acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ (the one-way traffic of love from man to God) with 'God so loved the world'. Bridges, emerging triumphantly from 'the darksome grove', does give that answer, and in those words—except for the significant change from 'loved' to 'loveth', for we are dealing with the Eternal Now.

'The orchestral player of the present time', says Adam Carse, 'must undergo long and arduous training in order to qualify for his exacting duties, and must be not only a specialist on his own particular instrument, but must include in his equipment a good measure of general musicianship, for his position as a unit in the complex organization demands both co-operation and individuality. . . . It should never be forgotten that, although the orchestral player usually figures as a nameless number of a corporate body, he is always an individual upon whose skill and co-operation the working of the whole elaborate structure depends.' By their chosen similes much is to be learnt of the deepest thought and faith of Plotinus and Bridges, and of their affinity. Music serves them both, and the master-word is harmony. Harmonies of orchestra or choir, though conveyed to us by wavelengths, are the work of a live composer's brain, a live conductor, live performers; yes, and Plotinus would add, of live wood and strings and metal. For him as for Wordsworth there is no region of existence unpenetrated by Spirit through Soul, and by the One, the First Cause, whose light reaches the outermost bounds directly, and also indirectly through Spirit and Soul. Instead of calling the One impersonal, we should rather call the whole personal. When the whole creation, the whole great choir and orchestra, turns with one accord to its conductor, 'that will be the end of playing ill—'. The conductor is one with his choir—one with the music.

This brings us back to our starting-point, Unity. Plotinus and Bridges assert one single plan or law for the Universe, including our human life. The plan or law can be called altruism, or the finding of self in not-self. In our human story, this is from one point of view the Fall, from another the Redemption. Plotinus represents it as both. The original separation of any self from the One, the act of self-assertion through some individual incarnation, and the taking on of some specific form, can be condemned as an inverted ambition, and 'by this fault-fell the angels' to their starry spheres, and man to his earthly exile. Yet that very 'descent' through incarnation is the essential and eternal act of the One, and the self-revelation of God. Throughout creation this act of self-revelation is copied by his godlike offspring. At every level compassion compels the descent to the lower level, and this is Love, the divine immanence. It is fulfilled by the corn of wheat that dies to be fruitful; by the nesting bird; by every willed sacrifice of self; by the will to live *in* the lives of others and the refusal to live at the cost of other lives. In our human relations, 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself', that simple and sufficient summary of the moral law, is our practical version of the natural and supernatural law: 'thy neighbour is thyself.'

'And who is my neighbour?' The *Enneads* might be called a metaphysical study of neighbourhood, which, through continuity, makes unity. Porphyry, trying to give

mathematical neatness and order to the confused manuscripts of Plotinus, did contrive to classify them in the six books, with nine tractates each, which he called the *Enneads*, and to give titles to each tractate. But the very titles, overlapping again and again, show that this clear-cut classification is not adapted to his master's thought. That thought moves in circles, or chains that are re-entrant, and is always breaking down the boundaries it seems to fix. There are no hard-and-fast barriers. There is a Trinity, but each 'Person' is all the Persons. Therefore my neighbour is my self and every self. The limitless extension of the commandment of Love is the only way of fulfilling the moral law, which is also the law of the Universe, natural and supernatural. Toward this conclusion the *Enneads* and *The Testament* steadily move.

Today, the harmonizing of the two laws has become a matter of life and death for the human race. It is by sundering them that science continues to work havoc among us and to destroy its own best achievements. It is a common-place that our knowledge has outstripped our morality. This is due to the apathy of the many, who evade their responsibility for the uses to which science is put, and also to the ultra-specialization of scientists, whose knowledge is not wisdom. We dare not, and we need not, any longer entrust our world to the abstractions of either scientists or philosophers. We could, and should, entrust it to those 'Kings', those practical idealists, who are masters of applied thought in both science and philosophy. But not only to them. They must find their enabling power in a democracy which will give, and require of them, a much simpler obedience to the universal law of the Good Neighbour. That is the shining light, and even now a sufficient guide for rulers and people alike—the true science, the true metaphysic, the true ethic. This is what Plotinus and Bridges would fain teach us all. But because the *manner* of their teaching obscures its essential simplicity, they lack interpreters. Those who have found its worth have an obligation to attempt, however humbly, the task of the Interpreter.

M. L. V. HUGHES

¹ *Select Passages illustrating Neoplatonism*, E. R. Dodds.

THE BASIS OF THE MORAL FACTOR IN EDUCATION

FROM the time that Christianity first spread in Europe, men, on the whole, accepted a common idea of what life was about. To quote a recent report of the Central Advisory Council for Education: 'They saw man's place and destiny as part of a divine plan and felt that man's conduct was subject to moral laws which were part of God's will. They might keep or break the laws, but they recognized that observance or breach of these laws was something more than a matter of private taste or social convention.'

The rise of the scientific tradition has been largely responsible for the break-up of this framework. It is not that the modern world has abandoned all moral standards; rather, there is a divergence of opinion concerning the basic convictions upon which such standards rest. In other words, there are many who are prepared to uphold 'moral values' for other reasons than the demands of Christian Theology.

The task confronting us is full of challenge. We face the adventure of erecting a new social, cultural, and religious framework, just as stable, and just as Christian, as that which is passing away. It will not follow the old familiar lines, but future generations may well look back upon it, as we look back, with pride and gratitude.

In this era of construction, Education will play a significant part. It can do no other; for good or ill it will be one of the great formative influences of the future. The Education Act 1944 has so enlarged the scope of Education that, when fully implemented, it will change the pattern of life both in its individual and corporate aspects. It is that which gives such prominence to the question—'Education for what?' It is all the more important because, as a recent speaker at the British Association declared—'Modern Education lacks a really profound view of its purposes.'

THE NEED FOR PURPOSE IN EDUCATION

Three things may be said on this matter. First, there is the need to safeguard Education from domination by a purpose that, in effect, makes Education impossible. To cast one's eye along a row of books on Education in any Public Library is to be impressed by the variety of purposes which have been conceived for Education. Without accepting John Dewey's utilitarian philosophy of Education there is wisdom in his warning: 'To set up any end outside education as furnishing its goal and standard, is to deprive the educational process of much of its meaning, and tends to make us rely upon false and external stimuli in dealing with the child.' There is need to safeguard Education from becoming the means to a preconceived end other than truth itself.

Second, there is the need for an end, if not 'outside the process of education', then beyond the process. To conceive Education without purpose is to conceive chaos. For such a process would be fatal to those being educated, frustrating to all engaged in the task of education, and impracticable as a policy. It would make way for the charlatan; and leave society to the fate of every wind of doctrine. In other words, there must be a transcendental element in Education. As Whitehead puts it—'Moral Education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness.'

Third, there is the need for the theorist to give direction to the practitioner. This is an important emphasis. Often the practitioner is scornful of the theorist.

It is argued that those who theorize have not tested or applied their principles in the actual work and life of the school. Recognizing this possibility, Prof. H. C. Barnard (*Short History of Education*) declares: 'Educational theory is often in advance of educational practice. . . . Some of the greatest advances in Education have been due to thinkers who have had little or no contact with the school itself.' The importance of this statement will be seen as we pursue our theme.

POSSIBLE ENDS FOR EDUCATION

Within the system of Education envisaged by those who framed the Education Act 1944, which represents the high-water mark of legislation in the sphere of Education, any one of many purposes may operate. These purposes must now be considered.

(1) *Utilitarian and Vocational.* There is a sense in which Education must be utilitarian and vocational. Man is not only an end in himself, he is also a means. In other words, man has a functional value. He is, besides being a man, a tinker, tailor, soldier, or sailor. Education must help to fit man to fulfil his function in society. It must be education for life and livelihood. Indeed, man cannot demonstrate his inherent value except as he fulfils his functional value. In practising his trade or profession, in bearing his social responsibility as a worker, a parent, and a citizen, he is also fashioning his moral nature. To be ill-equipped to bear these responsibilities means that man is frustrated and therefore falling short of what he might be.

One of the problems presented by the Industrial Revolution was how to bring a sense of purpose into a system so crippling to man's natural and moral development. This revolution had the effect of determining the pattern of Education for over a century. The rapid expansion of mechanization created a demand for cheap labour. It was not thought desirable or necessary to educate the working-classes, whose duty in life was to remain in the station where God has placed them. The poor had to wait for a revival of Arminian Theology which struck at the roots of Deism and Calvinism and gave birth to a social conscience.

The modern scientific period which led to a further expansion of industry has made fresh demands. No longer is it sufficient to provide for a supply of 'hands' for industry. The new demand is for highly skilled scientists and technicians. The emphasis is now upon scientific and technical education, with a resultant neglect of classical education and appreciation of the arts.

The advocates of the utilitarian and vocational philosophy of education need to heed the warning of Archbishop William Temple: 'The result of a purely scientific education . . . is to produce a generation adept at dealing with things, indifferently qualified to deal with people, and incapable of dealing with ideas.'

(2) *Totalitarian.* That is, to make Education the servant of a narrowly defined political, economic, or religious purpose. We have more than one modern example of this. Under such a system, truth is preconceived and the end predetermined. History is rewritten to support a political or economic philosophy. The arts are compressed into a prefabricated mould. Science is made to obey a political dictatorship. Even such pure subjects as mathematics are impregnated with the accepted philosophy.

Similar conditions have been produced when Education has been dominated

by the Church. One effect has been that truth has been subordinated to edification. It has also led to the suppression of many efforts to find truth. It is true, of course, that the aim has been to establish a Christian Education, but it has often led to abuse. W. H. Lecky (*History of European Morals*, II.14-15) describes the result of such a preconceived end for Education: '... A boundless intolerance of all divergence of opinion was united with an equally boundless toleration of falsehood and deliberate fraud that could favour received opinions. Credulity being taught as a virtue, and all conclusions being dictated by authority, a deadly torpor sank upon the human mind which for many centuries almost suspended its action.'

The Non-Conformist protest, and the reaction of secular Education may be viewed as encouraging indications that the search for truth cannot for ever be imprisoned. There will always be those who, while chained outwardly, will not be fettered within.

(3) *Citizenship*. Of all the suggested ends for Education this is the most recent, but the most vague. Greece is the mother of Education for citizenship, as of so much else. Yet citizenship must be seen in its modern context and not within the context of the ancient Greek City States.

Properly conceived, it involves all man's actions which touch his fellow citizens and affect the health and well-being of the State. It is almost synonymous with man's duty to his neighbour.

Sir Richard Livingstone, in *Education for a World Adrift*, discusses citizenship as a possible end for Education, and suggests that Education for citizenship involves three elements: (i) A knowledge of the State, both by instruction and what is most important by experience and action; (ii) a vision of the ideal State; (iii) the art and virtue of living in community.

This is becoming the substitute for Christian Education. Often it is based on the idea that there is only a historical connexion between morality and religion and that this connexion has nothing to do with the essential nature of these two categories. So you find Herbert Read can write: 'It is logically conceivable, and in my opinion, practically possible to re-establish moral action without waiting for a religious revival.'

If these are the only purposes Education is able to fulfil, then it is not surprising that it 'lacks a really profound view of its purposes'. One thing that each of these suggested ends for Education possess in common is the fact that they do not take account of man in his totality. The utilitarian view of Education assumes that man's value is primarily functional. That is also true, though for a very different reason, of the totalitarian view. The most noble of this trinity is 'education for citizenship', but one is led to ask—'What kind of citizenship and what kind of citizens?' The fundamental question concerns the nature of man.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT MAN?

Now this is a question which the practitioner as a practitioner cannot answer. As Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys has said in his little book, *Education—Christian or Pagan*: 'It is highly significant that for the deepest insight into educational problems one must go, not to the writings of the educationists, but to the theologians and philosopher scientists.' There are, in fact, a number of influences which seem to provide a philosophical basis for 'moral education'. These we must now consider.

Of each we must ask the fundamental question—"What is man?" It is the true answer to this question which provides the basis for moral education.

(1) *The Philosophers of ancient Greece.* While it is true that Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were not concerned primarily with the question, What is man? their philosophical and ethical ideas suggest what their answer would have been. Indeed, it is remarkable that the one thing upon which they are in fundamental agreement is that the ultimate good for every man is his own well-being. At the same time, there is no coherent pattern or doctrine of man.

Of particular importance is Plato's idea of the soul. He conceived it as a trinity in unity, in which Reason was a spirit and principle informing and indeed kindling the whole man, emotion as well as intellect. Plato held that the soul was capable of growth to good or evil; growth depends upon food, and to give this food is the duty of Education. But his main consideration is not with the individual but with the State.

Spencer Leeson, in his Bampton Lecture, considers the ideas of Plato as a possible basis for the moral factor in Education. He recognizes three weaknesses. First, Plato is interested chiefly in the education of the especially gifted natures, the few who are qualified to rule. In the second place, he questions the primacy given to the State. Finally, Plato fails, as all so-called philosophical religions fail, because he does not satisfy the deepest spiritual needs and instincts of man.

It is evident that there are dangers in slavishly following the ancient Greek philosophers in our endeavour to find the sure foundation of moral education.

(2) *The non-Christian religions.* It is not possible to examine the doctrine of man as held by the great non-Christian religions. They are important in any comparative study of religions, but the wide divergence of views between the great religions makes it impossible to effect a synthesis in answer to the question, What is man?

There are, however, two problems which affect our discussion. First, there is the genuine difficulty expressed by students when they question our insistence that Christians are on the side of truth. They are puzzled by the fact that some of the great non-Christian religions possess ethical teaching which bears comparison with that of Christianity. Moreover, they are impressed by the apparent ease with which non-Christians absorb 'the best elements of Christianity' without impairing their own faith.

The second problem arises out of the first. There is a very real attempt being made to reconcile conflicting religious ideas in a synthesis of ethical ideas. Some attempt on these lines has been made by Aldous Huxley in his *Perennial Philosophy*. The note on the dust-cover of this book expresses the underlying convictions: 'Beneath the revelations of all the great religions, the teaching of the wise and the holy of all faiths and the mystical experiences of every race and age there lies a basic unity of belief which is the closest approximation man can attain to truth and ultimate reality.' The note continues: 'Mr Huxley has made no attempt to "found a new religion", but in analysing natural theology of the saints, as he describes it, he provides us with an absolute standard of faith by which we can judge both our moral depravity as individuals and the insane and often criminal behaviour of the national societies we have created.'

Taken seriously, as Mr Huxley intends it to be, his approach has far-reaching implications. An acceptance of this approach by those engaged in the task of

Education would be destructive of all that we conceive Christian Education to be. The peculiar appeal of this attitude is that it acknowledges the indebtedness of the human race to the non-Christian world, and avoids the problem of explaining the uniqueness of the Christian revelation.

(3) *Naturalism*. This term is borrowed from Prof. T. E. Jessop, who examines the scientific account of man in an essay which he contributed to a composite volume called *The Christian Understanding of Man*.

Jessop declares that the apparent conflict between the scientific view of man and the Christian doctrine of man has arisen for two reasons. First, in the nineteenth century, when scientists were fighting for recognition, there was formulated the dogma that the scientific form of knowledge was the only form and that everything which could not be fitted into it was just unknowable. Although this did not persist for long it built itself into the pattern of popular philosophy. Then in the second place, the person with this scientific bias has been tempted to transfer his methods to realms where they do not properly belong. He may realize this, but feels perhaps that it is better to be imperfectly scientific than leave the scientific way altogether. The result is what Jessop calls 'Naturalism'.

'Its general content appears to be that the material universe needs nothing but material, at any rate purposeless factors for its explanation, that man is simply the creature of these factors and is completely destroyed by them; that his values are at best biological conveniences, entirely relative to his time and circumstance; and that every trace of his achievement will one day be annihilated. With such a philosophy no Christian can be friendly. This is the so-called science with which religion is and must for ever be in conflict.'

Education has felt the impact of this 'scientific attitude'. It is this, more than anything else, that has created the demand for specialization in technical education to the neglect of philosophy and religion; that has given birth to a generation 'adept at dealing with things . . . and incapable of dealing with ideas'; and that has substituted a philosophy of 'measurement' for one of 'moral values'.

THE SURE FOUNDATION

With such conflicting conceptions of the basis of the moral order it is not surprising that the modern world is a veritable tower of Babel. We live in days when many countries in the West are possessed by a popular and purposeless humanism which, at times, appears almost as an unbridled hedonism. Robert I. Calhoun writes of the modern world: 'Its keynote is active, conscious preoccupation with the present, that is, with affairs in the forefront of one's own time, and a comparative disregard for their larger backgrounds.'

In a world like this, Communism thrives because it is dynamic, and brings a sense of purpose to the present world with which men are preoccupied, and encourages that disregard for the eternal and supernatural of which men have become insensitive. We may say that Communism has made articulate the philosophy of our times.

The urgent need is for a philosophy of life that will redeem man out of the purposeless confusion of the present world; that will create an incentive to live and work; and that will set before him 'the habitual vision of greatness' which will set his hopes beyond time to eternity.

The Christian doctrine of man alone can provide the basis of such a philosophy. In the first place, it declares that man is made in the image of God to obey and love and serve Him. Nevertheless, by his own free choice man has refused to give God 'the glory due unto His name'. By this act of rebellion man has broken his filial relationship with God and the image of the divine in him has been marred. He is a fallen creature. In the language of the Bible he is a sinner. It is for this reason he cannot rescue himself; the corrupt cannot redeem, but must be redeemed.

The second great fact in the Christian doctrine of man is that God in Christ redeems man from sin and restores him to a right relationship with Himself. This act of redemption and reconciliation does no violence to man's freedom. As Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys, in *Glaucon*, writes: 'Because man is free, there can be nothing coercive about God's redemption. Conviction of sin and repentance—the act by which man lays himself open to God's grace—must be man's own free and responsible act. Once he has made it and yielded his self-will to God's will, God can take him and remake him, bringing him into the new life which has God and not self for its centre.'

This has two important implications for our discussion. First, this redemption and restoration is effected in the sphere of man's present life and therefore gives significance to it. Secondly, the vision of God in this restored relationship is seen to be the promise of a life lived for ever with God.

In this doctrine of man is to be found the basis for 'moral education'. There can be much that is noble in a system of education inspired by the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle; or by the mysticism and ethical teaching of the 'wise and holy of all faiths'; or by the modern 'scientific attitude'. But, as Prof. Jeffreys says: 'Without redemption by the grace of God, man's noblest spiritual attainment is tragedy. The essence of tragedy is that in the height of inspiration man falls to the depths, and yet when fallen can tower above his ruin.' By which he means that men may reach splendid heights as artists, philosophers, statesmen, and inventors, and yet remain members of a fallen race.

So then, Education must, like the Church and the home, be a redeemed and a redeeming influence. The moral factor in Education is inseparable from the redemptive purpose of God. The 'habitual vision of greatness' without which, Whitehead declares, moral education is impossible, is the vision of men and women living in complete harmony with God as true children. The acceptance of this as the basis of Education would have far-reaching implications. As Spencer Leeson declares: 'We believe that human beings are children of their Father in heaven, and that the purpose of their life is, assisted by His redeeming grace, to be like Him. In the light of that simple but complete statement of the origin, nature, duty, and destiny of man, our aim in education becomes clear, and the aim inspires the content and the method.'

G. THOMPSON BRAKE

BROADCASTING: AN ASSESSMENT

WE HAVE enjoyed and endured broadcasting in this country for over thirty years, sufficiently long to enable us to make some attempt at an assessment and to form at least a preliminary judgement whether on the whole it has proved more harmful than helpful to mankind. It will be generally agreed that so far as our country is concerned, broadcasting, in the words of the old advertisement, came as a boon and a blessing. There is no need to labour the point that it has been of inestimable benefit to a great multitude of people shut off from the full enjoyment of normal life, whether by age or infirmity, the nature of their occupation or their isolation, and above all, by their poverty. In the sphere of relaxation it has done better than well.

Says the Old Book: 'God hath made man upright: but they have sought out many inventions.' So far as radio is concerned, it is also true to say: 'God hath given man the power to seek out many inventions, but he has not been upright.' Broadcasting in itself is neither good nor evil, it is merely a means of communication by electrical signals which are transformed into recognizable sounds, ranging from the six pips of the Greenwich time signal to the brilliant complexities of Tannhauser. We all know that it is the people behind the microphone who matter, not the marvellous processes which have made broadcasting. None the less, too many of us are blameworthy when we treat broadcasting as an everyday commonplace, of no more significance than the electric light or water-tap which are of enormous importance to the material side of life, but are inarticulate in the spiritual and mental spheres.

John Wesley would have had a much deeper sense of the significance of broadcasting than most of his present-day followers, who seem to be *indifferent or blind* to its potentialities for good or ill. At the Conference of 1951, Dr C. A. Coulson quoted a passage from the *Primitive Physick* to the effect that well-wishers of mankind should make full investigation into the phenomenon of electricity. This was written by Wesley before the birth of Faraday and when only a very few facts about electricity were known, such as the power of attracting light bodies possessed by amber and similar substances. What would he have said of a means of communication which would have enabled him simultaneously to address multitudes which no man can number, greater by far than the aggregate of all the audiences to whom he preached during his long life?

If ever a true assessment of broadcasting is to be made it must originate from the standards which the BBC has laid down for itself. These were engraved by Eric Gill in the stone of the central arch of the entrance hall of Broadcasting House. The English translation of the Latin inscription is: 'This Temple of the Arts and Muses is dedicated to Almighty God by the first Governors of Broadcasting in the year 1931, Sir John Reith being Director General. It is their prayer that good seed sown may bring forth a good harvest, and that all things hostile to peace or purity may be banished from this house, and that the people, inclining their ears to whatsoever things are beautiful and honest and of good report, may tread the path of wisdom and uprightness.'

These standards were not fixed, of course, at the opening of Broadcasting House. They were fixed in November 1922, when the son of a distinguished Scottish manse, J. C. W. (Lord) Reith, was appointed general manager of the British

Broadcasting Company. He was embarking on a voyage on an uncharted sea, with no definite sailing instructions and no compass. But he had a star, the light which was shed on his path by Philippians 4¹. He had also the photograph of his father, Dr George Reith, in his moderatorial robes. When the son was in a difficulty, and difficulty was his constant portion, he would look at the photograph and ask himself: 'What would he have done?'

The difficult task of attempting to assess the impact of broadcasting is a little simplified if we keep those standards in mind, and see to what extent it has been possible to bridge the gap between the ideal and the reality. Has the seed sown been on the whole good seed? Have all things hostile to peace and purity been banished from the service? Have the people inclined their ears to whatsoever things are beautiful and honest and of good report? As a result of broadcasting have the people been encouraged and helped to tread the paths of wisdom and uprightness? It is very natural for the broadcaster to ask: 'Who is sufficient for these things?' It would be unreasonable to examine every detail of broadcasting to see if it makes the grade, but what about the general trends? Are they in harmony with or in conflict with the standards?

Let it be said that the BBC has maintained the highest standards in news, serious music, and in the innumerable talks which are skilfully framed and presented with the object of enlightening the people on serious issues in as agreeable a manner as possible. The BBC Listener Research department has discovered that if we have a university education we like symphony concerts, but if we have only an elementary education we like cinema organs. The BBC, recognizing that the people with only an elementary education constitute the vast majority of the listeners says: 'You will have both, but each must be the best of its kind.'

The importance of adhering to the highest standards is emphasized when we consider the strenuous efforts which were made to keep broadcasting as a means of light entertainment only. The attitude of many popular newspapers toward broadcasting might have been expressed: 'Cut out the enlightenment. Give us entertainment.' It must be regretfully confessed that many cultured people seemed to share this opinion. They refused to take the new medium seriously. They regarded it as a toy, a kind of glorified gramophone with an unlimited supply of cheap records. So they kept aloof.

It was at this juncture that J. C. W. Reith showed to the public the manner of man he was. He admitted that entertainment might be the primary function of a medium, the revenue for which was solely provided by the public, but he was adamant in his conviction and determination that broadcasting had also a much higher purpose. This is plainly set forth in his book, *Broadcast over Britain*, which was published in 1924: 'To have exploited so great a scientific invention for the purpose and pursuit of entertainment alone would have been a prostitution of its powers and an insult to the character and intelligence of the people. To have left unexplored the innumerable paths along which might pass influences, other than those normally associated with entertainment, would have stamped as sorry fellows those to whose care the administration of the invention had been committed.'

It was not until the General Strike of 1926 that broadcasting was taken seriously by the public and recognized for what it is, a medium of almost unlimited potentialities. Like Jonah's gourd it grew up in a night, but fortunately, unlike Jonah's

gourd, it did not perish in a day. During a crisis, when newspapers were prevented from appearing, when public transport on the roads was disorganized, there might have been endless panic and confusion had it not been for broadcasting. How eagerly we listened to the announcements about trains, about food distribution, and other matters which form the stuff of ordinary life. In a crisis, broadcasting is an urgent necessity.

In the sphere of religion, broadcasting has rendered great service to the cause of Christianity at home and in the English broadcasts overseas. When broadcasting began it was soon evident that religion was to play a considerable part in the programmes. There were a few voices raised in protest. As happens in other spheres, a tiny minority, sufficiently vociferous, can convey the impression of a great movement, swelling with passion, against some infringement, real or imaginary, of the rights of the people. The argument against religion on the air was that the BBC was a public service, financed by the people, and ought not to be used for the advancement of sectarian religion. The BBC reply was that Christianity was the official religion of this country, recognized as such by Parliament, and the King was the Defender of the Christian Faith. Further, there was ample evidence that the public wished religious services.

The showing-up of the secularists came about in an unexpected, but very convincing way. The Daily Service, still one of the best-loved BBC programmes, was introduced on 2nd January 1928. It was started as an experiment in response to a suggestion in the *Radio Times*. Within a week more than 7,000 letters of appreciation were received, which was very remarkable because the licence figure was only a sixth of what it is now. This response aroused great Press interest. The editor of an anti-religious journal suggested that the correspondence figures were unreliable. He strongly urged his readers to send letters of protest to the BBC. Less than twenty letters were received.

The BBC laid before the Beveridge Committee a list of listener preferences. There were seventeen categories. It was found that taking the population as a whole, religious services occupy the eighth place on the list. All the programmes preferred to religious services belong to the departments of light entertainment. Religious services are even preferred to dance bands, and they come before talks, short stories, features, grand opera, symphony concerts, and, of course, poetry reading and chamber music. Religious services also rank eighth with those of elementary education. Those who have a secondary education place talks, symphony concerts, and stories before religion, while the university-trained listeners think more of variety and musical comedy than religion. In all groups the popularity of religious services is more evident amongst women than men. With both sexes the popularity of religious services rises markedly with age.

By far the most acceptable religious service is Sunday Half Hour, which is devoted to community hymn-singing. Overseas listeners also prefer this service to any other. Another programme, popular at home and overseas, is 'Think on these Things', which is also devoted to hymn-singing, with brief comments on the meaning. It is a factor of some spiritual significance that so many people, particularly those belonging to what used to be termed the working-classes, still like to hear, and when possible, to sing the old, familiar, sacred melodies. They may be indifferent to the movements of modern thought, they may even have a theology which is out-worn or no theology at all, but if the singing of hymns associated with

their early days helps to keep alight a spiritual flame, the religious department will have deserved our gratitude.

The religious broadcasting policy of the BBC has been stated on many occasions but never more plainly than by the Archbishop of York at the end of the war: 'Religious broadcasting has three special purposes: first, it aims at enabling many who are unable to attend corporate worship to join in it, at home or in hospital or wherever else they may be. . . . It is impossible to estimate the help and encouragement given in this way to the sick, the depressed, and the isolated. Secondly, religious broadcasting aims at helping the regular church-goer. . . . The BBC has set a high standard in the conduct of worship, which gives inspiration and guidance to those who lead and take part in the worship of their respective churches. Thirdly and most important of all, religious broadcasting is a great evangelistic medium through which millions are reached who stand apart from all our churches.'

It will be admitted that the BBC has fulfilled the first two special purposes, prescribed for it by the Archbishop, but it is very doubtful if the same can be said of the third purpose, the work of evangelism. It is at this point that one is inclined to ask the old query of Professor Joad, 'What do you mean by?'—in this instance, evangelism. St Paul says: 'If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?' Without being unduly critical, it is relevant to say that when you listen to a Lutheran broadcast from Luxembourg you know what the main points of their Gospel are. You may not agree with their interpretation of the Gospel but you know what it is; and you understand also why the Lutheran Hour broadcasts have been wonderfully successful in many countries and in diverse tongues. If you wish to make converts, the BBC attitude of sweet reasonableness in religious broadcasts is not enough. This statement is not made from the theological standpoint, but from the broadcasting standpoint.

If you listen over a period to the ordinary Protestant religious broadcasts you are left in a state of perplexity as to what the cardinal truths of the Gospel are, and you often find that good men are using the same words with different meaning. Is it any wonder that the BBC broadcasts, while they have been most helpful to those who are Christians, and have doubtless kept alive a tiny spark of faith in many others, as a means of bringing souls from darkness to light, have been a grievous disappointment. The essence of propaganda, religious or otherwise, is that you have a message to deliver, you say it as often as possible and you never change the message, however much you may vary its presentation.

There can be little doubt that the most important broadcasts undertaken by the BBC are the Christmas messages of the Sovereign, which have had an incalculable effect in promoting the spirit of friendly unity between the Mother country and all parts of the Commonwealth and Empire. It is interesting to recall that King George the Fifth in 1932 established Empire broadcasting on a sure foundation. The new short-wave service was started on a very modest basis with a programme allowance of £10, but no one was sure of its success. Six days later King George broadcast his first Christmas message. It was a complete triumph and was heard all over the Empire and in many other countries. Every intelligent person recognized that a new means of speaking to the whole world had been found and that the King had been the first world speaker.

King George the Sixth inherited his father's microphone gifts, and our present young Queen is also a broadcaster of the highest class. We like to think that the

broadcasts of our late King not only strengthened the bonds of Empire, but that they played a considerable part in helping to keep India, Pakistan, and Ceylon within the Empire. Although they went their own way, constitutionally they decided to stay within the Commonwealth and they acknowledged the King as Head. Broadcasting transformed the Crown from being a convenient legal symbol, through the personality of the King, into a living reality.

Broadcasting in this country has only one foe to fear, and that singularly enough is a member of its own household—television. Television has already made broadcasting a back number in the United States. The Audience Research department of the BBC has stated clearly that evening viewing drastically reduces evening listening. Television is among the most wonderful of scientific discoveries, but in the main it can only live by purveying more and more popular entertainment. It is not a serious factor in our social life, so far as its programmes are concerned, but its concentration on entertainment, for all but a few of its offerings, may have grave social consequences.

WALTER C. SMITH

Notes and Discussions

TWO STUDIES IN SCIENCE

C. F. VON WEIZSÄCKER is a prominent young physicist who has made contributions in particular to astrophysics. At the same time he has concerned himself with the philosophy of science and with the ultimate questions toward which science leads. These he approaches with a philosophical awareness greater than we commonly find in a scientist, and also with a vital appreciation of the Christian Faith. When we come to the fundamental and practical issues he avows that he has 'not been able to find any convincing solution that avoided Christianity'. He evidently speaks from experience when he adds that contact with Continental nihilism may help one to hear the Christian message in its freshness. The purpose of this article is to call attention to the two books from his pen which have been translated into English: *The History of Nature* and *The World View of Physics*.¹

The first is a non-technical account of the scientific view of the world and its history. There are chapters on the spatial structure of the universe, stars and star systems, the earth and life. These are followed by chapters entitled 'The Soul', 'Man: outer history' and 'Man: inner history', while the two opening chapters relate the natural sciences to the humanities. For, as Weizsäcker believes, it is necessary to guard against two misunderstandings of science: first, the underestimating, neglect or rejection of the influence of science upon the *whole* of our lives and our outlook; the other, neglect of the limitations and even the dangers of a *merely* scientific approach to the fundamental questions of life. It is time to ask whether Science and Religion can exist without each other.

The World View of Physics consists of seven essays written during several years. Even so there is fair continuity of thought. While non-technical, in the sense that there is no mathematics, this book is far more weighty than the first. Three chapters

deal with the changed views within science, and the remaining four with some of the philosophical consequences of these new views. In effect, Chapter 1 links up with the two opening chapters of *The History of Nature*, for it raises some general questions about the scientific world view—e.g. what is lacking in the physical picture of the world? To answer this question Weizsäcker picks up a piece of Iceland Spar. The scientific account of it, gathered from the reports of physicist, chemist, and geologist, omits any reference to its *emotional* value to its owner. Therefore the physical view of the world does not embrace all the essential properties of objects. We are reminded of the similar illustration used by E. Spranger² to distinguish between the various mental attitudes which are the source of various valuations (or, as we might say, modes of experience), such as the aesthetic, economic, scientific, and religious.

While Weizsäcker does not pursue this line of argument at any length, he does distinguish between the instrumental knowledge—which brings power, and which is a knowledge of fragments—and 'insight'—which considers the coherence of the whole, and is especially concerned with man himself, his motives, his aims, and the inner and outer conditions of his existence. The cleavage between science and the humanities does not reside so much in the subject-matter, for in part that overlaps, as in approach and method. Natural science isolates the comprehending subject from the object which is comprehended. The humanistic disciplines accept man as he knows himself, and try to turn even the subject in his subjectivity into an object of understanding. Yet there is not a sharp cleavage between human understanding and causal understanding. What Weizsäcker calls 'subjective comprehensibility' may be of various grades, depending upon the extent to which there is subjective content in the object. For instance, in the sentence: 'When we understand a mathematical law of nature, we understand as much of nature as can be understood at all.' What then is the cause of the limitation of the physical way of thinking? Not its quantitative procedure which is only a symptom. The cause is to be found rather in the precise focusing of science on that which gives us instrumental knowledge and the power to control. Its danger is that it holds us back from the 'human exertion needed to maintain our living contact with the whole'. The scientific and technical world of modern man is the result of his daring enterprise, 'knowledge without love'. Not even personality as such sets any limits to the application of causality. Man himself may be treated as an 'It' and experimented upon. But he who refuses to address his fellow man as 'Thou' deprives himself of the decisive experience about him. And 'Thou' is a value almost without protection. Weizsäcker even suggests that it was because 'the transition from loving to purely factual knowledge' had not been made, that there was a lack of experimental knowledge in the Middle Ages.

It is curious that Weizsäcker never refers to Wilhelm Dilthey when he is considering the relation of the sciences to the humanities. It is a recurrent theme in the eleven volumes of Dilthey's *Gesammelte Schriften*.³ It appears to us that it is along the lines followed much farther by Dilthey than by Weizsäcker, that we can best approach the whole question of the relationship of science and religion, taking in turn the relationship of science to the humanities and of the humanities to religion. Weizsäcker hardly follows this way farther than biology. While he sees that the objection to vitalism is that the 'Thou' has been forgotten—which means that the realm of experience has not been fully exploited—it seems an error to

make an attempt to find biological phenomena which can be verified physically but which can *never* be explained in terms of physics. All we can say is that we use many concepts in biology which cannot be reduced to physical concepts *at present*, but who can anticipate the unknown results of future research? We should not make sharp distinctions between living and non-living objects, but 'between the sources of knowledge in pure physics and the sources of knowledge at our disposal in our contact with things that are unquestionably living'.

So far we have only followed out subjects suggested by Chapter 1 of *The World View of Physics*. In Chapter 2 we are given a most excellent critical investigation of the foundations of the atomic theory of modern physics. It is made clear that it is not the law of causality which is found to break down but rather the category of substance that has collapsed. Quantum mechanics affords a critique, not of the concept of the causal nexus, but of the 'thing or event in itself'. The apparent contradiction that particles can appear as waves and waves as particles arises from the circumstance that what we are dealing with must, in order to be known at all, be brought into contact with some sort of measuring apparatus. The way in which this is done determines the interpretation, in terms of waves or particles, which we give. It is misleading to express the indeterminacy of measurable quantities by connecting it with the disturbance of the object by the act of observation, for this suggests that the object, before it was disturbed, had certain properties which the act of observation destroys.

Since every statement about the atom has a clear meaning only in relation to the measurement through which it was obtained, it follows that neither picture (wave or particle) is a 'uniquely justified description of an objective nature'. The experiment itself brings to birth the state of reality which it shows us. We cannot pass from the waves and particles revealed *in* the experiment to a hypothetical, objective, undisturbed state of particles or waves *before* it. That is why the category of substance and not that of causality is affected in the first instance. The definitive difference of quantum mechanics from classical physics is that it cannot even enunciate its propositions without at the same time expressing the way in which they are known. This is a revolutionary principle, not only for physics, but also for most philosophical systems.

The account of modern physics runs into the first part of Chapter 4, which is on the relation of quantum mechanics to the philosophy of Kant. After Kant's theses have been expounded, the attempt is made to apply his doctrine to the description of the cognitive situation of modern physics. We seem to arrive at a reinterpretation of the *à priori* comparable to that given with much greater elaboration by C. I. Lewis in *Mind and the World Order*⁴ and extended by A. Pap in *The A Priori in Physical Theory*.⁵ Those who are competent must judge for themselves; it is for us the most difficult part of the book. The next chapter, on the Infinity of the World, gives an account of the present critique of the idea of infinity by relativity theory, quantum mechanics and thermodynamics, with a side-glance at mathematics. If in places the chapter is too dogmatic, the reader may turn to books which deal with these matters at greater length, such as *The Structure of the Universe* by G. J. Whitrow,⁶ or the more technical recent survey by H. Bondi.⁷ One passage, in which Weizsäcker speaks of the almost religious relation of many scientists to their object, is likely to catch the eye—'Not only does it require an attitude of devotion and faith to create the conditions for a discovery; but the awe before the

truth as it bursts upon us, before the abyss into which we look when all at once and undeniably we meet the reality we have not made, is close to the awe of man before God.'

The point of departure in Chapter 6 is Leibniz's designation of the real world as the best of all possible worlds. It is contended that the argument of the Leibnizian 'Theodicy' is exactly analogous to that of the variational principles of physics. Fermat's principle, which he enunciated in 1657 in the form, 'Nature always acts by the shortest course', from which he correctly deduced the path of a ray of light which suffered reflection or refraction, is one such principle. The curious feature of this principle is that the path of the ray is apparently determined by the end point which it is to reach, for how otherwise can it follow the shortest path (strictly, the shortest or longest path)? No wonder that the variational principles have often been understood as expressing the purposive character of natural events. The subject therefore leads to the problem of relating cause and purpose. Two or three pages here merit careful attention. One conclusion which Weizsäcker reaches is that 'before God there is no difference between the causality and finality of the cosmic process'. The closing chapter on 'The Experiment' we have already considered, for it deals with some of the wider issues with which we started. A final point remains, the relation of science and religion. In Chapter 5 the contrast is drawn between Kepler, for whom the positive knowledge of science points to God, and Newton, for whom it is precisely the gaps in this knowledge which leave room for God, since he believed that the stability of the planetary system needs the occasional intervention of God. In the earlier book Weizsäcker takes Kepler, Pascal, and Laplace as representatives of the three attitudes which are possible. Kepler could 'experience God in the mathematical law of nature'. Pascal could not, and since his concern was with God, he gave up the study of mathematics. Laplace neither could nor would find God in mathematics, so he spoke of what is mathematically demonstrable and left God alone. This comparison is not carried into detail, though it may deserve it. We are left with the important but negative conclusion that to argue from a gap in knowledge is 'probably the worst form of proof of the existence of God'. We have here two brief yet informative and stimulating studies, written from a standpoint which many of our readers share, and lacking the childish misunderstanding of everything which is not science that mars some of our popular books.

A. W. HEATHCOTE

¹ Translated respectively by F. D. Wieck and M. Grene (Routledge & Kegan Paul)

² In *Types of Man*, trans. P. J. W. Pigors (M. Niemeyer, Halle).

³ Published B. R. Teubner (Leipzig & Berlin). See especially Vols. 1, V, VII, VIII. H. A. Hodges: *Wilhelm Dilthey: an introduction* (Kegan Paul, 1937), was the first book in English on Dilthey.

It had been preceded by five articles in *Laudate* and one in the *Arist. Soc. Supp.*, Vol. XI (1932).

⁴ C. Scribner's Sons (New York, 1929). ⁵ King's Crown Press (Morningside Heights, New York, 1946).

⁶ Hutchinson (1950). ⁷ *Cosmology*, (C. U. P., 1952).

EASTER SUNDAY AT FULNECK, 1753

ON EASTER SUNDAY morning, two hundred years ago, several thousand persons gathered together at Fulneck, near Bradford, to hear a sermon from the gifted Moravian preacher, Benjamin de la Trobe. They gathered together, partly because they were interested in the amazing transformation which had taken place at Fulneck in the previous nine years.

Some idea of those changes can be gathered from the fact that a rough, uncultivated tract of land, covered with briars and brambles, had, in less than a decade, been transformed into a heaven on earth—a sort of community which possessed its own civil as well as religious regulations—a kind of colony in the heart of Yorkshire.

The colonizers were the Moravians, a denomination which originated in the fifteenth century, and which first appeared in Yorkshire in about 1731, when the Yorkshire evangelist, Benjamin Ingham, introduced the first missionary. Benjamin Ingham had accompanied John and Charles Wesley to Georgia in 1735, and on his return had joined the Moravians, and established a number of Moravian congregations in various parts of Yorkshire. Ingham had bought the land at Fulneck in January 1744, and for a time they paid him a yearly rent for it, but they later obtained it on a grant for five hundred years. In May 1746 the site was consecrated, and in June 1748 the plan was completed, even to the construction of an organ by Snetzler, then the most eminent organ-builder at that time in England. A house for labourers was finished in 1748, one for the brethren and the sisters in 1752, and a boys' boarding-school in 1753.

While the buildings were being put up, the Fulneck settlement was visited by John Wesley who, ten years before, had been a member of the Moravian community at Fetter Lane Chapel, London. (This membership he retained for two years, and he left them only when he established the 'Methodist' society.) In his diary, he wrote: 'It is on the side of a hill, commanding all the vale beneath, and the opposite hill. The front is exceedingly grand, though plain, being faced with smooth white stone. The Germans suppose it will cost by the time it is finished about three thousand pounds. It is well if it be not nearer ten. But it is no concern of the English brethren. They are told (and potently believe) that "All the money will come from beyond the sea".'

Wesley's description was quite accurate—the brethren from beyond the sea did contribute. The German branch sent money, and the Norwegians sent timber.

The Fulneck community did everything. A clothing-business was begun in 1748, followed by a worsted and glove factory, a farm, a tailor's shop, and a shoemaker's. These were all carried on by the brothers, or men of the community. The sisters carried on with needlework and hosiery. Each trade was called a diacony.

After twelve years of association with the Moravians, Ingham found their increasing arrogance intolerable and separated from them. He took with him about eighty congregations, who henceforward called themselves Inghamites. In 1755 when he attended the annual conference of the Wesleys at Leeds, he proposed that they should amalgamate. While Charles Wesley was willing, John was not agreeable—and the idea was rejected.

The Moravians kept up their 'community' policy, looking to their great continental leaders and taking part in missions. The diaconies, or trades, were finally abandoned in 1837, because the semi-monastic form of life which the Moravians

imposed on their followers proved too strict. In 1853 they resolved to aim at the extension of their church. Their spirit lingers, inspiring some of the best hymns in the English language. I was forcibly reminded of this when Mr Churchill, addressing the Eighth Army at Tripoli, quoted a passage from one of the most famous of these hymns written by James Montgomery—a pupil at Fulneck:

*We nightly pitch our moving tents,
A days march nearer home.*

And that was what the Moravians kept on doing.

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

WESLEY'S HANDWRITING

THERE are few notable persons whose handwriting is so familiar to students as is the calligraphy of the Rev. John Wesley. It is easy to identify a letter of his at first sight if one has examined a number of his writings, or of the reproductions of them illustrated in the *Standard Journals* or the *Standard Letters*. His penmanship is characteristic and its special features persist over a period of seventy years. The earliest specimen reproduced in the *Standard Letters* is a letter preserved at the Charterhouse written when he was a little over eighteen years of age. It is a beautiful example of good writing, as well as illustrating the high sense of honour which he held.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were notable for the attention paid to good scripts. Writing-masters were in demand. A number of professors of the art taught it and wrote about it. For example there was George Bickham's book: *The Universal Penman; or the Art of Writing Made Useful to the Gentleman and Scholar, as the Man of Business. Written with the Friendly Assistance of several of the most Eminent Masters.* (London: 1733-43.)

It would appear as if in his childhood, John Wesley was taught by his mother Susanna Wesley to print each letter in much the same way as school children often do today. As they grow older they learn to link the letters into a cursive hand, urged by the necessity of writing more quickly. In Wesley's writing of his early years the letters are frequently detached; later in his life a more flowing hand evolved. But he never completely lost his youthful custom of separating his individual letters. Indeed there are few words in his adult correspondence—words of two or more syllables—which are completely joined up. Where there is a 'd' in a word he writes it like a Greek Delta with the top of the letter turned back, and this necessarily broke the continuity of the word. There is an important exception to this. Generally he writes the word God with a capital 'D'. There is a similar habit in his letter 'G'. He rarely completes the under loop to join the letter to the succeeding one as is done today. Wesley did not complete the loop, but turned the bottom stroke to the left, sometimes with a slight flourish, so that the next letter had to begin afresh. Instances are the words 'forget', 'design', 'negligence'. (For example see the letter to Jonathan Edmondson of 1st September 1790.) Naturally he followed the fashion of his time, and wrote 'ye' for 'the'. He also used the old form of the letter 's' which seems to be an 'f'. In general he disregarded all flourishes though they were

believed to be genteel and scholarly; Wesley, however, refused to use them as being evidences of pomposity and vanity.

He was a deliberate and not a speedy writer; this is apparent from two facts: first that he never came by a completely cursive hand, leaving gaps in the letters of his words. And second, he did not allow the final letters of his words to tail off into illegibility. There is no evidence in his writing of an impetuous, unrestrained, or hasty correspondent. His script is always amazingly neat. As he was tidy and clean in his clothes and person, so he was also neat in his correspondence. The lines are always straight; they begin with an even margin at the left hand, and they neither dip nor ascend. They are perfectly straight and at an exact distance from one another, as if he were writing on ruled paper. He may have used some sort of under-pad with dark ruled lines which showed through and guided him, but this is unlikely, because the paper on which he wrote was not a highly glazed paper but was rough surfaced, and not particularly transparent. It is something of a marvel that he succeeded in keeping his lines at a regular spacing. In several of the letters that I have measured, the distances between the lines is exactly ten millimetres. The usual height of his ordinary alphabetic letters is three-quarters of a millimetre. Some letters he placed higher or lower than we usually do today. He is a little uncertain how to write the letter 's', whether in its modern form or in the old-time shape, like an 'f'. Where there is a double 's' in the middle of a word as in 'Blessed', the first of the two letters is written 'f'. The same form is used also when a word begins with 's' followed by a consonant; for example, 'stop', 'spirit', 'scorn'. But he follows no fixed rule in such matters. The ampersand, '&' (which he uses more frequently than is customary with us), was written like a capital letter and well extended above the line of script. On the other hand the capital 'C' is carried below the line. Many of his capitals are a little like German letters, and his predilection for using capital letters for the most ordinary nouns is also somewhat German.

The slant of his letters is approximately twenty degrees from the vertical. This may be considered as his one concession to speed in his multitudinous epistles. There are two famous persons whose calligraphy bears a certain resemblance to Wesley's—Thackeray and Thomas Carlyle, but each of them wrote an almost upright hand.

The Rev. Nehemiah Curnock, in his introduction to the *Standard Journals*, says of the early Diaries:

All the monthly reviews, the resolutions, general and particular questions, confessions and ejaculatory prayers, are written with minute care. They are pictures of neatness, order, succinctness, and, except for a few eccentricities of letters and figure formation, might be set as copies for schoolboy imitation.

And of a later Diary the same author says:

The writing is good, and there are many signs of an increasing orderliness and steadfastness in daily life. The Diarist has become a Methodist, and that not only in relation to the great affairs of life, but also and equally in such details as calligraphy, margins, paging, and dates. In form and style it is the diary of a man living according to rule.

In spite of his arduous labours, his constant travelling, his physical handicaps,

he produced two hundred and thirty original works, and wrote with his own hand many thousands of letters to all sorts of people and on every variety of subject, from the curing of nettle-rash to the saving of a soul. He used no amanuensis, and had never heard of a typewriter. He had no fountain pen, nor even a steel nib. Everything was written with his own hand, with pens fashioned by himself from goose quills. Sometimes, too, the writing was done in a shaky coach rumbling along dreadful roads. (As an example see the letter of 1769 written to John Mason, pictured in the *Standard Journals*, Vol. V, page 343.)

One has only to look at the fine calligraphy of his letters to feel a sense of shame for the slovenliness, dilatoriness, and downright laziness of us modern people in the matter of personal correspondence.

R. LEE COLE

Books used:

The Psychology of Handwriting, Robert Sauder.

Pennmanship of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, L. F. Day.

(continued from page 159)

The Churchman, December (Church Book Room Press, 1s. 6d.).

The Holy Spirit and Baptism, by G. W. H. Lampe.

The Holy Spirit in St. Paul's Writings, by R. F. Hettlinger.

The Expository Times, December (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).

The Kenosis Doctrine in H. R. Mackintosh's 'Person of Jesus Christ', by Philip S. Watson.

The Importance of P. T. Forsyth (*vis-a-vis* Barth), by N. H. G. Robinson.

The Kingdom of God has Come (*re* meaning of *engizien*), by W. R. Hutton.

do, January

The Person of Christ: Moberly's 'Atonement and Personality', by Gordon Rupp.

A New Chronology of Saint Paul's Life, by George Ogg.

do, February

The Person of Christ: Relton's 'Study in Christology', by A. R. Vine.

Science and Religion: the Present Position from a Scientist's Point of View, by Archibald W. Sloan.

The Ministry of Women, by C. E. Raven.

The Congregational Quarterly, January (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).

God in His World, by Charles S. Duthie.

The Centenary of Robertson of Brighton, by Perrin J. Spooner.

Churches and Community Associations, by J. Alan Chambers.

The Hibbert Journal, January (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

Russian Theology (Berdyaeff and Frank), by W. R. Inge.

Vedanta and the West, by Sir John Stewart-Wallace.

The Kerugma: Is our Version Correct? by T. F. Glasson.

The Present State of Psychological Medicine, by H. Osmond and J. R. Smythie

Theistic Arguments in the Greek Philosophers, by John Ferguson.

The International Review of Missions, January (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).

A Survey of the Year 1952, by M(argaret) S(inclair).

Reflexions after Lund, by Henry R. T. Brandreth.

A Programme for Missionary Language Learning, by William A. Smalley.

Recent Literature

Saint Pierre—Disciple, Apôtre, Martyr, par Oscar Cullmann. (Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel, 12fr. 50 suisses).

The personality of St Peter and his position in the early Church have been terribly obscured by unceasing controversy. Only very rarely has either a Catholic or Protestant succeeded in even an approach to objectivity when writing of Peter, who has himself therefore become almost an unknown figure. Professor Cullmann has done us all the very great service of carefully and dispassionately investigating, one by one, all the problems (except that of the authorship of 1 Peter), historical, exegetical, and doctrinal, which have gathered round the apostle whom most of us feel to be closest to ourselves, not least in his weaknesses. The author's conclusions can be briefly listed. In Jesus' lifetime Peter was the representative of the Twelve, and was appointed to take the lead after the Master's death. This leadership he exercised for a while in Jerusalem, but gave up in order to administer the mission to the Jews in Judea and other countries. In his capacity as leader of that mission he came to Rome in the time of Nero; he was never Bishop of the Church there, and shortly after his arrival was executed in the great persecution. It is probable that he was brought to his death by jealousy among the Christians, as suggested by I. Clement, and that he was buried in a common grave; a monument was later erected at his place of execution, but his tomb was not known and cannot ever be found. In Matthew 16:18 the 'Rock' sayings are genuine, but are in the wrong context, 'the Church' being, not the Church as we conceive it, but the new 'people of God'. The Church is founded on Peter, as the foundation-stone, but his function as such is *ex hypothesi* non-transmissible to any successors. But this bare list does no justice to the learning and balance of the arguments. Professor Cullmann's French is beautifully clear. RUPERT E. DAVIES.

Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, by Rudolf Bultmann. (S.C.M. Press, 25s.)

In this volume Prof Bultmann treats the message of Jesus, of the early Church apart from St Paul, and the theology of St Paul. A second volume will deal with the theology of St John and the development toward the theology of the ancient Church. Together they will contain the fruits of a lifetime of study. Volume I is a veritable mine of information. Prof. Bultmann's vast erudition is beyond all question. His familiarity with Rabbinic literature, with that of Greece and Rome, and of the whole Hellenistic world is plain for all to see. He is also a philologist with few equals, and is active in present theological debates. His main positions in Gospel criticism are already well known, and in this volume there is little new in this realm. The Gospels contain three main strands—the old tradition of the actual message of Jesus, ideas produced in and by the early Church, and the editorial work of the Evangelists. Since the message of Jesus was thoroughly apocalyptic and eschatological, many of the sayings ascribed to him cannot be his. He did not found an order or sect, far less a Church. He did not believe he was the Messiah, all the Messianic passages being the creation of the early Church. For Bultmann what is commonly called 'realized eschatology' is escape-reasoning, used to avoid the difficulties which arose when the immediately expected end did not take place. Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi and the account of the Transfiguration are Easter stories projected backwards. The accounts of the Baptism and Temptation are legendary. The early Church made the change by which the *bearer* of the message became its essential content. 'The proclaimer became the proclaimed.' The scandal of the Cross had then to be accounted for and this was done in terms of expiatory sacrifice. The most rewarding part of the book is that which deals with the theology of St Paul. Here Bultmann's great learning throws light on many passages, and, while it must not be assumed that when he

turns to the Pauline Epistles the Professor suddenly becomes orthodox, his study of 'Man prior to the Revelation of Faith' and 'Man under Faith' is one to which his readers will frequently return. The dominant influence in the Apostle's thought is said to be Hellenism. His theological, anthropological, and soteriological ideas are neither a recapitulation of Jesus' own preaching nor a further development of it. The Gospel as we know it is a Pauline creation. If Bultmann's views are correct one wonders how the Apostles at Jerusalem found it possible to approve of St Paul at all. They could hardly have received him as a brother but must surely have seen that he preached another Gospel. We remain convinced that Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and that, though he was greatly influenced by Hellenistic thought, the formative influence in his thinking was Hebraic and his Gospel coincided with the Gospel preached by the other Apostles.

This is a book for the scholar. The ecclesiastic will not like it nor will many a theologian, but one who had the privilege of sitting for two years at Prof Bultmann's feet would like, in conclusion, to pay humble tribute to his unquestionable integrity and to his enduring concern that people today should hear and respond to 'the Word of God'.

PERCY SCOTT

The Doctrines of the Christian Faith, by Sydney Cave. (Independent Press, 12s. 6d.)

The Faith We Preach, by E. C. Blackman. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.)

The Faith, a Symposium, Edited by Fredk. A. Tatford. (Pickering & Inglis, 18s. 6d.)

These three very different books are all general surveys of the whole field of doctrine. The first is a reprint of a book first published in 1931. A new preface makes some slight adjustments, calling attention, for instance, to the changed relations between Barth and Brunner, but the body of the book is still surprisingly up-to-date; thus the very first page contains the word *herugma*, the emphasis on which seems one of the marks of the present period. The book is still very valuable for its clarity, its moderation, and its arrangement. The author, believing that 'the history of a doctrine is its best exposition', gives brief historical accounts of the main doctrines, which are masterpieces of compression and judicious selection. There are, of course, omissions; we should like a word about the dangers of Pelagianism and a fuller account of the evangelical doctrines of justification, assurance, and sanctification. But as a bird's-eye view of the subject for the theological student or as a refresher course for the busy minister, this is a book to recommend. Mr Blackman's book is of smaller compass, being intended chiefly for Lay Preachers; it sometimes wanders from this aim, as in its use of the word 'monism' without explanation. The book is interesting, and goes into greater detail than that of Dr Cave about justification and the Methodist doctrine of perfection—though, unfortunately, these discussions come several pages after the words, 'Our ground is covered. The essentials of our subject have been considered'! The last book, a composite work intended to state the biblical truths in a form easily intelligible to the non-specialist, is written from a Fundamentalist standpoint, though the chapter on the Scriptures by Mr F. F. Bruce avoids the extremes of that position. Readers who belong to this school of thought will find it useful.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

The Formation of the New Testament, by H. F. D. Sparks. (S.C.M., 13s. 6d.)

Professor Sparks' book is written with the concise clarity and impartiality which those who know his work expect. As a rule he does not attempt new solutions of old problems, and he never makes pontifical decisions between plausible alternatives, but shows plainly what different opinions are held—for example, about the date and destination of Galatians and the authorship of Ephesians. While he generally indicates his own preference, he never browbeats the elementary students for whom he writes. In him they have, for the most part, a safe guide. It is chiefly in his Prologue and Epilogue that Prof Sparks, very briefly, develops his own views, and it is here that he may find rebellious readers. He begins with the maxim that the New Testament is 'the Church's book'. This is true 'not

so much because the Church has for centuries *possessed* it, as because the Church originally *produced* it', and this in two senses—first, 'the individual books were written within the bosom of the Church and to satisfy the needs of the Church', and second, 'it was the Church that defined authoritatively what books the New Testament should contain and what it should not' (pp. 11f.). This means that 'New Testament and Church belong together. . . . We have no right today either to receive the New Testament, or to interpret it, as of independent authority' (p. 156). Whether or not this is a true and adequate doctrine of the New Testament is much too large a question to discuss in a short review. The reviewer can only note that Prof Sparks' own brief account of the formation of the New Testament canon confirms him in the belief that the New Testament books were not, as it were, rubber-stamped with the Church's overriding authority, but imposed themselves authoritatively upon the Church.

C. K. BARRETT

How to know your Bible, by A. Victor Murray. (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.)

This is a business-like introduction to the Bible. After a brief account of the Bible as a whole, the author takes nine representative books—five from the Old Testament and four from the New, chosen mainly to show their literary arrangement—for the reader to get the 'feel' of the Bible. Then an outline is given of Old Testament history, followed by the New Testament narrative, with appropriate reference to the relevant books. Those whom the author has in mind—'ordinary lay people who are willing to take a little time or trouble to know their Bible'—will find here the quintessence of many bigger and more technical books. Busy preachers and teachers in particular would benefit by working through this book. It should also prove illuminating to those who think of the Bible as out-of-date or as a hotch-potch of ancient literature, with little meaning or order. The chief criticism is twofold: First, the author, in his desire to avoid critical discussion, tends to be too dogmatic. The word 'probably' might well be inserted in a few places—e.g. in the statement about the date of Mark's Gospel or the Epistle to the Hebrews or the meaning of the term Son of Man. Secondly, in his desire to be 'popular' and non-technical, the author indulges in colloquialisms and other stylistic mannerisms which at times border on the facetious. Most of the exclamation marks might well be deleted. H. A. GUY

Augustine to Galileo: the History of Science A.D. 400—1650, by A. C. Crombie. (Falcon Press, 42s.)

Hitherto, the student, turning from a particular science to the wider study of the history of science, has been at a loss for a comprehensive work in English for the period connecting the classical with the modern world. Now any reader whose appetite was whetted by Butterfield's *Origins of Modern Science* can turn with profit to this more detailed yet readable study. There are six well-subdivided chapters. The first briefly summarizes the ideas of the natural world held in Western Christendom from the Dark Ages to the twelfth century. Next we are shown the influx of Greek and Arabic knowledge and its reception in the West. Although this material formed for the most part a coherent whole, and in its range and power was beyond anything previously known in the West, it was not accepted merely passively. In Chapter 3 we see the system of scientific theory which emerged in the thirteenth century. A paragraph near the end of this chapter is worth quoting: 'Few people at the end of the thirteenth century, apart from the Averroists, believed that Aristotle had said the last word on philosophy and natural science and, though all would have admitted that he had provided them with the framework of their system of scientific thought, the theologians were careful to preserve both man and God from constraint within any particular system. The free speculation which resulted led to radical criticisms of many of the fundamental principles accepted in the thirteenth century. . . . Within natural science perhaps the most fundamental advance . . . was in scientific method and the conception of scientific explanation and this, together with the development of technology, formed the double track that led across the watershed of the

fourteenth century and, with many turns, to the sixteenth and seventeenth-century world.' In Chapter 4 the relation of Technics and Science during the whole medieval period is presented. While in the Dark Ages there was a considerable loss of technical knowledge, from the tenth century a gradual improvement took place, and the gains were never lost. There are many interesting subsections to this chapter—e.g. on the history of music or agriculture—but the overall theme is that modern science owes its origin 'to a marriage of the manual habits of technics with the rational habits of logic and mathematics', which 'burst from the constraining hands of its late scholastic guardians in the seventeenth century and conquered all Europe'. With Chapter 5 we are introduced to the development of ideas on scientific method and the beginnings of the conscious understanding of the nature of the enterprise in which the new science was engaged. This leads to Chapter 6, on the revolution in scientific theory in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In its initial stages it came about rather by the type of question asked than by an increase in technical equipment. It is easier, says Crombie, to understand how it came about than why. It led to modern technology, to a new understanding of the world and to philosophical problems that are still with us. Nineteen valuable pages of bibliography follow, including articles of outstanding importance. We have here a book essential for the serious student and attractive for all interested in its subject. A. W. HEATHCOTE

Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude, by W. A. Whitehouse. (Oliver & Boyd, 12s. 6d.)

Many of us have been prepared to concede to Barthianism a place as a much-needed corrective, but we judged that, like all correctives, it swung too far, and indeed, in its transcendental emphasis, was in danger of leaning toward an undisciplined irrationalism. This book may give us pause. Few subjects have left us more uneasy than our attempts to justify our faith in face of the critique of Science. The area of 'revelation' steadily diminishes, and Science has long been unwilling to 'keep off the grass' at the theological garden-parties where 'why?' is being discussed. If we do not give its technique and authority, based on observation and experiment, due weight, we are brushed aside as irrelevant—and we know it. Yet Mr Whitehouse, standing firmly in the Barthian line, takes the issues clearly, without compromise to the Christian Faith. His method is to examine one by one our dogmas, showing what each affirms, and then to demonstrate why, in its own right, it is worthy of the respect and attention, not only of working scientists, but of all whose life and thought are affected by their technique. Alongside what they observe, both of physical nature and of men *estranged from God*, here are *facts* of the Divine Activity, facts about the Divine Nature, which could have become known only in the personal Coming of the Word-made-flesh. Though beyond objective observation, they are capable of responsible human apprehension. The question for Science is not the validity of its technique, which is admitted, but the scope of the realm in whose service that technique is enlisted. The writer claims that under this technique the full faith stands, in authority of its Divine Humility, God's Word to a world estranged. This book does a great deal to show why and how the door of faith stands as open as ever today.

T. J. FOINETTE

Studies in Philosophy, by R. F. A. Hoernlé, (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

Religion in Human Experience, by John R. Everett. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

Hume's Intentions, by J. A. Passmore. (Cambridge Press, 18s.)

An Analysis of Resemblance, by R. W. Church. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.)

These four books are a welcome reminder that philosophy still claims a place in publishers' lists. The first volume is posthumous. It contains ten unpublished and nine reprinted essays, together with a memoir by Dr Robinson, director of the school of philosophy at the University of Southern California. Hoernlé, son of a German missionary and orientalist, was born in India, educated at Bonn and Oxford, and held appointments at St

Andrews, Cape Town, Durham, Harvard, and Witwatersrand Universities. His outlook was influenced by this variety of environment. His sympathies were Idealist in philosophy and, in general, he taught a Christian humanism. His cosmopolitanism accounts for the fact that his abilities were not better appreciated. Had he remained in England or America, he would have been recognized for what he was—a first-class thinker. The unpublished essays are chiefly upon truth and error, fact and value, knowledge and faith. One interesting point in the reprinted essays is the discussion of the relation of Plato's God to his Form of the Good. Prof Hoernlé expounds the issues but ends by saying: 'What would we not give for a chance of eliciting from Plato another immortal dialogue giving us his definite solution to our difficulties!' But is it not possible that Plato himself would not be able to solve the dualism of good and evil which appears in his thought? Plato never set himself to weave all his dialogues into a final and consistent scheme. Had he tried to do so, he might have found it as impossible as do his commentators. But for Prof Hoernlé's book as a whole, one may be glad.

Mr Everett, an American writer, does not attempt to define religion formally and in that he is wise. His concern is with its characteristics and historical manifestations. He deals with Hinduism, Buddhism, Shinto, Hebrew religion, Judaism, and Christianity, but not directly with Islam or Zoroastrianism. He touches briefly on modern religious systems. Methodists may be surprised to learn that they were 'originally and have remained episcopalian in government'. The book has a useful glossary and bibliography. Some of its judgements seem a little arbitrary—for example, the average Anglican does not 'refuse to recognize the ministries of non-episcopal churches as valid spokesmen for God', but as irregular rather than invalid. In the main, however, Mr Everett is informative and, in view of the vast field he touches, makes very good use of his space. He is best in his treatment of Buddhism. The book has a number of interesting illustrations.

Prof Passmore switches us back to David Hume, about whom much has been written in recent years. Prof Passmore justifies his attempt to add to the enigma. His first sentence is, 'Hume is one of the most exasperating of philosophers', and his last: 'No one could be a Humean in the sense in which he could be a Hegelian; to be a Humean, precisely, is to take no system as final, nothing as ultimate except the spirit of inquiry.' What were Hume's intentions perhaps even Hume himself did not know. He was a veritable catfish in the sea of philosophers, provocative, even perverse, and yet at times revealing traces of firmer convictions than his alleged scepticism warrants. One cannot escape the notion that Hume was impishly delighted by his reputation as a sad sceptic and enjoyed tormenting Scottish orthodoxy with his conundrums. Like Hobbes, he was more influential in the reactions he provoked than in his own speculations. It is due to Hume, more than to anybody else, that philosophy has had to face the problems of causation. Prof Passmore is a good guide. He is neither pro-Hume nor anti-Hume, as so many expositors have been, and his book throws light, and at times fresh light, on Hume's philosophy and will be of use and interest to any who desire to know more of it.

Professor Church's book is of a type which is fashionable today. It will prove very interesting to the modern school which is so concerned with 'the meaning of meaning', and exasperating to those who think that philosophy has forsaken its telescopic outlook on the vast problems of existence for a microscopic study of verbal exactitude. What do we mean when we say one thing resembles another? The average man sees no difficulty in answering, but if he could be persuaded to read Professor Church's book, he might well change his mind and give up the attempt to define resemblance. Those whose interest is in this direction will find much enlightenment in this scholarly analysis. E. S. WATERHOUSE

A Critical Examination of Von Hügel's Philosophy of Religion, by Albert A. Cock. (Hugh Rees, 10s. 6d.)

The writer of this little volume was one of Von Hügel's intimate circle, and his indebtedness to the Baron in the development of his spiritual understanding and experience is

manifest throughout these pages. He regards *The Mystical Element of Religion* as Von Hügel's chief work. It postulates three essential constituents of any religious system: the Institutional, the Credal, and the mystical, as expressing modes of Living, Thinking and Being. The writer points out, with much elaboration of detail, that these are the constituents also of many non-religious societies, and even of the Russian Constitution. Part of his criticism of Von Hügel's treatment of this subject is that it is too neat and schematic with its Hegelian insistence on Triads, and that there is too little recognition of 'the Numinous'. The Baron's other publications are in turn passed in review, with useful summaries, and with essays in which our author expounds his own views. Much of their matter appears to be taken from papers read before various Societies. While they are interesting, there are times when we lose sight of Von Hügel. Mr Cock contends that, though generally regarded as a 'Mystic', the Baron had too much knowledge of and respect for modern Science, History, and Biblical Criticism for that term to be applied to him without qualification. In the chapter on 'Rethinking Apologetics' there is an illuminating exposition of that 'Givenness' which is so central in Von Hügel's teaching. Here Craftsmanship is introduced as 'a weighty consideration for apologetics'. There is first the Given, the raw material—'a stone, a sound, a log, a light'—and, working on these, the craftsman learns that he must renounce his own errant desires and false suppositions and accept and learn to use these things—the Given—as they are. There follows Response: 'the material yields to the disciplined hand, eye, tongue.' Then there ensues 'a progressive intimacy' between the Thing and the craftsman'. There is the joy of Creation, and this, for the craftsman, means Re-creation, and Re-creation means, supremely, Love.

There is no room for reference to one of the Baron's best-known books, *Eternal Life*, of which the author is specially critical. Amongst other subjects dealt with are Prayer, Personality (where Mr Cock is very self-revealing), Suffering and God, Heaven and Hell, the Reality of God. Both style and punctuation leave something to be desired, but the book is clearly the work of a loving, yet discriminating, disciple of the Master, of whom he rightly remarks that 'He remains the writer's writer, the thinker's thinker'.

W. L. DOUGHTY

The Missionary Factor in East Africa, by Roland Oliver. (Longmans, Green & Co., 17s. 6d.)

It is all to the good that a competent secular historian should assess the part played by the Christian Church in the development of East Africa. Dr Oliver has sedulously studied available material in the archives of governments and missions as well as printed resources, and has supplemented this study by spending a year in the territories he writes about. The result is a volume of unique value, lucidly written, objective, appreciative, critical. It covers both Protestant and Roman Catholic missions, most attention being given to the larger societies, Methodist work therefore receiving scant notice. This vivid picture of the great enterprise shows authoritatively the preponderant share of the Church in making East Africa what it is; and today we may well ask what would have happened but for Christian influence. Beginning with the story of Krapf and his colleagues, Dr Oliver brings out clearly the overriding influence of Livingstone, not least in enlarging the conception of the Church's mission, and lucidly delineates the successive phases of expansion and consolidation. Coming to the later stages he shows how it was the missionary groups that took the initiative in determining British colonial policy in regard to land and labour, to education, and to the linking of scientific research with the civilizing process in founding the International African Institute. In this connexion he pays a fine tribute to that great Christian statesman, J. H. Oldham. Dr Oliver discerns the dangers arising from the co-operation of Church and State in education. The Church may suffer, and is suffering, by that alliance, in that the ablest Africans are being drawn into the well-paid teaching profession rather than into the ministry, the one profession which has not so far gained from higher education. Dr Oliver's final words

should be pondered—'It is possible that the decisive act of the missionary drama lies still in the future, and that it is in the theological colleges, in the secondary schools, and above all in the impact of European Christianity upon visiting students from Africa that the future legacy of the missionary factor relatively to that of the secular forces of the "European Conquest" will be finally determined.' Perhaps an equally competent sociologist will supplement this work by looking at the same facts from the African point of view and estimating the effects, disintegrative and reintegrative, of the missions upon African society. This might help us to understand more clearly why so many educated Africans revolt against the Christianity to which they owe so much—as in Mau Mau.

EDWIN W. SMITH

Religion in an African City, by Geoffrey Parrinder. (Oxford Press, 15s.)

Geoffrey Parrinder has attempted, with a measure of success, a difficult piece of work. His book is *both* anthropological and 'Missionary'. 'Culture-contact' has engaged him. How readily one has recalled, on reading the book, pioneer days in Eastern Nigeria more than forty years ago. Theirs was no easy task, but, while it was adventurous and the pioneers were not unaware of some of the implications of what they attempted, it was all easy as compared with the problems of today. Pressure from without has meant stir and urge, and, since so many Africans are no longer 'backward', brought on 'growing-pains'. Commerce, Government, Religion cannot escape responsibility for the fact that life is no longer what it was. The author has tried to see the whole picture as presented in an African city of some 350,000 people. Every feature is noted: Pagan Religion; Islam, with its own particular appeal, making progress, more especially as it has moved southwards; the great Missionary Churches, Anglican, Roman, Methodist, Baptist, and others, all applying themselves with devotion to their great task; the 'Separatist Sects'. It seems almost incredible that in one city, however large, there should be more than a dozen of the last. In most of them the Bible has an important place, but it is not a pleasant thing to know that 'these are sects which have split away from, or sprung up in relative independence of, the older mission churches', for it is sadly true that the great weakness of the separatists is their isolation from the main body of Christendom. There are Appendices, Tables of Statistics, and the author's own photographs, all of which lend their own interest to the book. The writer knows Yoruba, and has spent a decade in other parts of West Africa—two great advantages for his task.

W. NORCROSS

The Throne, the Cradle, and the Star, by J. Ernest Rattenbury. (The Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

After this Manner, by Clement H. Pugsley. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

With *The Throne, the Cradle, and the Star* Rattenbury completes his series of devotional studies for all the Sundays in the Christian Year. Although this is the last of the series, it covers the first part of the year, Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, and the five Sundays following. It deals therefore with such subjects as the Bible, Judgement, the Light of the Gentiles, and the Centurion; there are some sensible and wise things said about Mary the Mother of our Lord, and a stimulating treatment of the parable of the Wheat and the Tares. Dr Rattenbury is not afraid to tell us about people he has met and experiences he has had, and these personal encounters are always interesting. Everyone will enjoy his story about a vegetarian, and everyone will be moved by his conversation with the old Irish Catholic who spent the time at Mass picturing Christ on his way to Calvary, being crucified, and praying for his enemies. 'And you know, sir,' said the Irishman, 'I think he was praying for me.' Readers of *The Adoration of the Lamb* and *O'er every Foe Victorious* will find here the same enthusiasm for the Church's traditions, the same love for the collects and the hymn-book, the same capacity for an occasional epigram, the same fondness for the poets—especially the Victorians—the same love for Methodism, and the same large-hearted charitableness.

The Lord's Prayer is the greatest and most inexhaustible of all prayers, but there are many people who have never really learned how to use it and who find that constant repetition has made it stale and unprofitable. They need something that will make them see the rich content of each clause and fill its generalities with particular meaning. Mr Pugsley's anthology of prayer and meditation will help them. Each clause of the Lord's Prayer is expanded and developed in the words of men and women of all ages, and this is done thirty-one times so that the prayer can be seen through different eyes on each day of the month. Like all good books of meditation, this one does not aim at saving the user the trouble of thinking for himself, but gives him a starting-point from which his own thoughts and prayers can proceed. He will not find every extract equally useful, and he is not meant to meditate upon them all; the hope is that each day one of the thoughts will grip his mind and start him along the way of prayer.

J. ALAN KAY

Reflections on Life and Religion, by Sir James Baillie. Edited by Sir Walter Moberly and Prof O. de Selincourt. (George Allen & Unwin, 16s.)

Whatever is—is Right? by Ivon Braby. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

The late Sir James Baillie had several sound books to his credit before he became immersed in public service as Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University and in sundry other capacities. After that he contrived to keep his mind philosophically alive by frequent original reflections in a series of commonplace books. From these, after the ten years' silence imposed by Sir James's will, two eminent scholars, who were once his colleagues, have made a volume of selections. The result will bear comparison with Berkeley's work in the same *genre*, though it falls much short of Pascal's. Most of it consists of reflections on religion, from a point of view that can be vaguely called 'Hegelian'. At times this outlook led Sir James to something that looks like an acceptance of orthodox Christianity, and at other times to something that looks like its explicit denial; one could wish that the entries had been dated, so that one might have seen in which direction Sir James's mind was moving. But there is much to learn from what he says in either mood. In particular, what he says about the whole man in religion, and about beauty in morality, deserves pondering. The whole book is a reflection of its author's gracious and stimulating mind.

Professional philosophers and theologians are likely to look askance at the second book. It consists of a restatement of the Argument from Design, with a solution of the problem of evil along the lines of Leibnizian 'compossibility', the whole being cast in the form of a commentary on parts of Pope's *Essay on Man*. All these are under a cloud nowadays, but perhaps they are none the worse for that. Mr Braby is an engineer, and he marshals the scientific evidence very ably, though sometimes he makes anthropocentric assumptions which recall the *Bridgewater Treatises* at their weakest. Parts of the treatment of the problem of evil are altogether too jaunty. But the book as a whole is sound and clear.

J. F. BUTLER

Belief in Action, by K. N. Bell (G. Bell & Sons, 8s. 6d.)

The New Road from Bethlehem, by Philip W. Lilley. (Blackie & Son, 8s. 6d.)

It would be churlish to take exception to the equivocal title, *Belief in Action*, when the book is so challenging, with no uncertain sound, no purple patch, periodic sentence, circumlocution, or theological jargon. He who runs may read this collection of sermons on special occasions, talks to Guides and C.L.B.'s, exposition of collects, biographies of saints, and so forth. They are simple, wise, straight-forward, hard-hitting talks, but, alas! we miss the approach to the Cross and a real evangelical appeal. This criticism is in one's mind also in reading the second book, until amends are made in the last chapter, on Ephesians 2. These short sermons are excellent so far as they go, but 'enthusiasm' is not in evidence either in the eighteenth or twentieth-century meaning of the term. The writer, however, has more than a nodding acquaintance with great literature and there are many felicitous references. The printers and binders have done well: it is a pleasure to see and handle such a book.

HAROLD MALLINSON

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

The Dominion of Christ, by L. S. Thornton (Dacre Press, 25s.). Dr Thornton tells us that in this, 'the second part of a treatise on the Form of the Servant', the dominant subject is 'integration'. This has several meanings, the word 'identification' helping. There is the integration of the teaching of the two Testaments, much heed being given to LXX, the integration of the old Creation in the new, the integration of Creation and Redemption, the integration of Suffering and Triumph, and so on. This is a subject that needed investigation, and there is no need to say that what a scholar like Dr Thornton has to say about it is of value. He gives special attention to the Christological passage in Philippians 2, the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, and the week that ended with the Transfiguration. But it seems to me that very much of this book exhibits a mistaken use of an occasionally justifiable method. To quote one of Dr Thornton's own accounts of his method, 'the prologue of St John (like other parts of Scripture)' may be 'read at different levels or depths' and 'interpreted in more than one way'. This at once suggests the Jewish method of interpretation of which Philo was the chief exponent. There is no doubt that there are a few examples of 'philonizing' in the New Testament (e.g. in 1 Corinthians 10:1-11), but Dr Thornton finds it almost everywhere. For instance, he seems to believe that in the story of 'the withered hand' (Mark 3:1-6), Jesus silently expected His hearers to compare and contrast His miracle with the story of Moses' 'leprous' hand as type and anti-type. At any rate he believes that Mark expected his *Gentile* readers to do this. Another instance will show the lengths to which Dr Thornton goes in this return to 'typology'. He draws a valuable parallel between the Week that led to the Transfiguration and Holy Week, adding a comparison with the week that began in the Jewish year with the Day of Atonement and ended with the Feast of Tabernacles. In the Temple there was a native rock which, in Jewish legend, stopped the mouth of the Under-world, and it is likely enough that the Blood of Atonement was poured upon it in the Second Temple, where there was no Ark. But Dr Thornton identifies it, at various 'levels', with the 'stone that the builders rejected' and the name 'Peter', which means a 'stone'. Jesus again, is in some sense 'identified' both with the Temple rock and with Peter, and so we pass to the saying: 'The Gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.' But Jesus calls Peter, 'Simon son of *Jonah*', and there is a Jonah in the Old Testament, who, when he was swallowed by the monster of the *tehom* (which is *not* Sheol in the Old Testament), might be said to stop the mouth of the Underworld. Jesus, then, is the true Jonah, and so, in some sense, Peter is His 'son', or why should he be called '*Bar-Jonah*'? In such extraordinary exegesis has not Dr Thornton made a 'stone' into a 'stumbling-block'? This is an extreme example, but it is 'type' of many, many passages. There is wheat in this book, but there is much chaff too, and a reader needs to use a sieve on almost every page.

Concise Bible Commentary, by W. K. Lowther Clarke (S.P.C.K., 30s.). Canon Lowther Clarke began collecting the materials contained in this 'one-man commentary' forty years ago. He gives about a third of the space to a series of articles on background, Introduction, and so on. With a 'glossary' in an Appendix (a collection of short articles on a number of leading terms), this serves some of the purposes of a 'concise' Bible Dictionary. The commentary itself is almost as brief as possible, except that there is a useful 'Synoptic Commentary', showing the differences between the three first Gospels. The Apocrypha (taken rather summarily) is included. Where important differences occur among the experts, these are generally mentioned (without names), the writer usually making his own choice. Of course there is no room for extended discussions even here.

Elsewhere the writer just gives his own interpretation, with some appearance of an *ipse dixit*—but what else was he to do? Usually he takes a 'moderate' position, and this is what most non-expert readers want. While I do not, of course, agree with him everywhere, this seems to me the best 'one-volume commentary' available, largely because 'much grist has come to the mill' since the *Abingdon* (1929) and even the 'Supplement' (1936) to 'Peake'. Dr Clarke's 'forty years' end with the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are seventeen small but clear outline-maps and diagrams, and there is an index.

Ezekiel and Alexander, by Laurence E. Browne (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). Prof. Browne holds that Ezekiel lived about 330 B.C., perhaps near the Caspian, and that all his oracles refer to the invasion of Alexander, the references to Jehoiachin, etc., being camouflage. He argues his case passage by passage. Now for his brother experts!

The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, by H. H. Rowley (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 16s.). Prof. Rowley has held his hand till now about 'the Scrolls', collecting most of the multitudinous articles and pamphlets and books of other scholars, and pondering them. Now he gives us a considered 'interim report'—'interim' both because new documents still await publication, and because the discussion still goes on. There is hardly need to say that, if a reader wants one book on the subject, this is the book for him. There are chapters on 'The Cave and its Contents', 'The Battle of the Scrolls', and 'The Covenants and their History'. Prof. Rowley assigns the Scrolls provisionally to the Maccabean period.

The Acts of the Apostles, by H. A. Guy (Macmillan, 6s.). 'Ditto'—that is, while one might 'pin-prick' at two or three places, Mr Guy has provided a brief, excellent handbook for 'intelligent readers', whether examinees or not, to another New Testament book. After an Introduction, in which he deals clearly with all the relevant questions, he divides *Acts* into short sections, giving a summary of each and then elucidating all points that need it. Please keep it up, Mr Guy.

Studies in Biblical Theology (S.C.M.): *Myth in the New Testament*, by Ian Henderson (7s.); *God who Acts*, by G. Ernest Wright (8s.). During the war Prof. Bultmann, seeking to answer the question, 'How shall the Church reach the common man?' wrote a pamphlet to advocate the 'Demythologizing of the New Testament'. There followed a discussion in Germany, which still continues. Mr Henderson gives us first an account of Bultmann's essay, then of the philosophical basis of the kind of existentialism that Bultmann advocates, then of his treatment of the historical factor in the problem, and finally asks whether we need de-mythologize at all, carefully explaining what *Bultmann* means by 'myth', 'existential', 'historical', and so on. Of other writers named, Heidegger and Thielicke are chief. Of course, most Christians de-mythologize, as when we say that, 'heaven' is not literally 'up there'—but what when Bultmann says that it is only under 'myth' that Christ's death may be called a 'sacrifice'? It is high time that we sought a criterion of de-mythologizing. Mr Henderson has opened up the current German discussion with skilful lucidity.

In the second volume Prof. Wright of Chicago opens up another current question (with rather too much repetition): 'If, as is now agreed, the God of the Bible is primarily God of History, ought not theology to be based on history?' He gives a provisional outline of such a theology, its first item being 'election'. He, too, deals with Bultmann's 'de-mythologizing', rightly pointing out that, in effect, this reduces the essential facts of history to one, the experience of fellowship with Christ. On the other hand, Prof. Wright himself, while holding that true religion is fellowship with God, does far less than justice to the Christian experience of salvation. In his outline he does not even mention it. Would he say that it is not a historical fact? Again, allowing, for example, that the Jews went wrong with history when they ascribed the whole Law to Moses, he claims that it is only

certain central biblical facts that are essential. What is to be the criterion? He has not persuaded me that certain Bible passages provide one. None the less, this study furnishes valuable *prolegomena* to a pressing problem.

The Archaeology of World Religions, by Jack Finegan (Princeton University Press, via Oxford Press, 63s.). In this volume Mr Finegan deals with all the *living* religions except the 'Hebrew-Christian', on which he has written earlier. His sub-title runs: 'The Background of Primitivism (for this survives), Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Islam, and Sikhism.' To prepare for this huge task he has read widely (always documenting his statements), travelled round the world, and collected 260 photographs (but not, it seems, taking any himself). These vary in quality, sometimes because the object photographed is hard to take. They include sculptures, buildings, sites, pictures, and so on. Of course there is *one* kind of sculpture—e.g. at Sanchi and Puri and Benares—that he cannot use. The eighty pages on Hinduism will serve as an example of the method which, *mutatis mutandis*, Mr Finegan follows everywhere. Using the history of India from pre-Vedic times to c. A.D.1200 as a frame-work (sometimes hardly giving more than a list of names), he describes briefly the chief features of Hinduism at its various stages, giving quotations (in English) from the sacred books as he goes along, and referring to the relevant pictures. It will be seen that the title 'archaeology' by no means does justice to the scope of the book. Its distinction is that it gathers together so many pictures, illustrating so many religions at so many periods, and relates them to their environment.

Vedanta for Modern Man, edited by Christopher Isherwood (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 25s.). This is an anthology of articles selected from the issues of *Vedanta and the West*, the organ of the Ramakrishna Order, since 1945. Of thirty-six contributors just over half are Indians, including Mr Nehru. Mr Aldous Huxley appears ten times. The subjects vary from direct expositions of Vedantism to 'Progress' and 'Old Age'.

First Called Christians, a Study in Names, by Gustave Isely (Salvationist Publishing House, 4s. 6d.). 'First called Christians', and *then* many other things—e.g. Asinari and Brownists and Culdees and Waldenses and Hookers and Petrobrusians and so on and so on. The crowd gathers from almost every Christian century. What had all these in common? An appeal to the Bible against the Church, a fearless witness, persecution even unto death, a 'life hid with Christ in God'. All but a very few were 'nobodies' in the eyes of men, but they kept intact a 'succession' from a certain fisherman who was an Apostle. The writer of the book, a French Swiss by birth, is a Lieut.-Commissioner in the Salvation Army. While he names no sources, he has been careful about his facts.

Near the Brink, Observations of a Nonagenarian, by L. P. Jacks (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). In several chapters of this book including a tale of a policeman that fairly scampers, Dr Jacks depicts, from one aspect and another, the ultimate futility of the maxim *Si vis pacem, para bellum*. His own hope lies in the slow education of mankind in Humanism, with God in the background. Of other chapters there is one that tells why the author is a 'disciple' of Alfred Loisy. But it is chiefly in the first five chapters, the meditations of a confident nonagenarian on death and time and light and beauty that there is 'treasure trove'. In this book there are all the old qualities—for instance, cogent surprise and silent irony. There is a fine portrait.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

Akbar's Religious Thought reflected in Mogul Painting, with forty plates, by Emily Wellesz (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.).

War and Human Values, by Francis E. Pollard, with portrait, second edition (Peace News Ltd, 2s. 6d.).

Why I believe, eight broadcast talks, by John Foster, John Baillie, David Cairns, and others (The Epworth Press, 5s.).

Tree of Knowledge, poems by Vivien Cutting (Montgomeryshire Printing Co., Newtown, 3s. 6d.).

If thou Criest after Knowledge, by Sir Aylmer Firebrace (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 25s.).

Not a Sparrow Falls and other Sermons, by Paul Quillian (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.00).

The Story of Quakerism in Scotland, 1650-1850, by George B. Burnet (James Clarke & Co., 15s.).

Contrast Psychology, by Murdo Mackenzie (George Allen & Unwin, 21s.).

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

Faith and Order, the Report of the World Conference at Lund, 1952 (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.). . . . *The British Council, Report for 1951-2* (British Council Office, 65 Davies Street, W.1). . . . *The Biblical Doctrine of Work*, by Alan Richardson (S.C.M., 5s.). . . . *Why not have a Drink—if you're a Christian?*, by John Murray (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.). . . . *St Ethelreda's and Ely Place*, by Linwood Sleight (Paternoster Publications, London, E.C.4, 4s. 6d.). . . . *John Roberts, Evangelist*, by Ethel B. Rohu (Salvationist Publishing House, 2s.). . . . *Christ's Message for Today*, by McEwan Lawson (James Clarke & Co., 1s.). . . . *Korea through British Eyes* (answers to 114 questions asked at lectures in Britain), by Whang-Kyung Koh (from Dr Koh at 9 Elm Grove, London, N.W.2). . . . *The Lord's Supper*, by R. J. Anglin Johnson (The Epworth Press, 6d.). . . . *The Free Churches and the State*, by Ernest A. Payne (Independent Press, 9d.). . . . *The Seven Windows of Calvary*, by J. Ernest Rattenbury (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). . . . *The Spirit of God in the Synoptic Gospels*, by Irwin Wesley Batdorf (Princeton Pamphlets, Princeton, New Jersey). . . . *The Meaning of the Forty boys*, by Ernest G. Loosley (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.).

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas: Bulletin III (5s. 6d. post free from The Oxonian Press, Queen St., Oxford).

Principalities and Powers, by William Manson.

The Gentile World in the Thought of Jesus, by Joachim Jeremias.

Mark's Use of Gospel Tradition, by Vincent Taylor.

An Inquiry into the use and limitations of the Theme of Vindication in the New Testament, by C. F. D. Moule.

Theology Today, October (Princeton Press, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 5s.).

Seven articles on the place and import of Christianity in University teaching.—e.g. in science, politics and philosophy.

do, January

Willigen and Lund (a critical estimate), by Paul L. Lehmann.

The Indigenous Expansion of the Christian Church, by Alexander McLeish.

Can the Churches give a Common Message to the World?, by Leslie Newbigin.

The Harvard Theological Review, October (Harvard University Press, via Oxford Press, \$1.00).

The Roman Army and the Roman Religious Year (from Augustus to Constantine), by Arthur Darby Nock.

Deus per Naturam, Deus per Gratiā (re Kingship in Theology, 400—1100 A.D.), by Ernst H. Kantorowicz.

The Journal of Religion, October (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.75).

About "Justification by Faith Alone" (an attack), by Walter Laurie.

Christianity and the Meaning of History, by Paul Ricoeur.

The Journal of Theological Studies, October (Oxford Press, 18s.).

The Eucharistic Interpretation of the Miracle of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel, by G. H. Boobyer.

Judaea and Rome: The Official Commentary (in coinage from Pompey to Hadrian), by H. St. J. Hart.

The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again, by A. N. Sherwin-White.

Haracritus' alleged Logos Doctrine, by T. F. Glasson.

(continued on page 147)

Our Contributors

- W. H. G. ARMYTAGE,**
M.A.
Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Sheffield. Author of *A. J. Mundella 1825-97*; *The Liberal Background of the Labour Movement* (1951); and *Thomas Hughes: A Life of the Author of Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1953).
- ALBERT D. BELDEN,**
D.D.
Congregational Minister. Member of National Free Church Federal Council. Vice-President of University of London Society. Member of National Peace Council. Contributor to *Manchester Evening News*. Author of *Pax Christi*.
- G. THOMPSON BRAKE**
Methodist Minister. Student of Education affairs. Represented the Methodist Church on Committees for preparation and adoption of Agreed Syllabus of Religious Instruction for schools in Norwich and Norfolk.
- R. LEE COLE,**
M.A., B.D.
President of the Irish Branch of the Wesley Historical Society. Authority on Irish Methodist History. Delivered the Wesley Historical Society Lecture No. 4 at Hull Conference in 1938 on 'John Wesley's Journal'. Ex-President of the Irish Methodist Conference.
- C. A. COULSON,**
M.A., PH.D., D.SC.,
F.INST.P., F.R.S.E., F.R.S.
Since 1952 Rouse Ball Professor of Applied Mathematics, Oxford University, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Theoretical Physics at King's College, London. Author of three scientific text-books and some 130 research papers. Local Preacher for over twenty years. Sometime member of Home Mission Committee, Church Membership Committee, Methodist Ecumenical Committee, etc. Fairly frequent broadcaster.
- D. R. DAVIES**
M.A.
Rector of St Mary Magdalen, St Leonards-on-Sea. Author of *On to Orthodoxy*; *Down Peacock's Feathers*; and a volume of Sermons, *Thirty Minutes to Raise the Dead*.
- T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN**
Educated Moravian Schools and Harrogate College. Chartered Accountant. Founded the Atlantic Union. Hon. Secretary, International Arbitration League (supported by Andrew Carnegie).
- A. W. HEATHCOTE,**
PH.D., M.A., M.TH., M.SC.
Methodist Minister. Science Degrees in Physics, in Logic and Mathematics, and in the History and Philosophy of Science. PH.D. thesis: *Prolegomena to the Study of the Relationship between Science and Religion*.
- M. L. V. HUGHES,**
B.A.
Author of *Citizens To Be, Everyman's Testament of Beauty* (Study of Robert Bridges' poem). Chief interest: Christian Philosophy applied to Peace, Education, and Social Reform.
- R. ELLIOTT KENDALL**
Methodist Minister. Missionary in China under the Methodist Missionary Society 1939-51. Arrested and deported by Communist Government. Has broadcast about his experiences and observations. Author of *Beyond the Clouds*, a missionary biography.
- H. G. MEECHAM,**
M.A., D.D., PH.D.
Principal and Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature, Hartley Victoria College, Manchester; Lecturer in New Testament in the University of Manchester; Hartley Lecturer (1932). Author of *Light From Ancient Letters*, *The Oldest Version of the Bible*, *The Letter of Aristeas*, *The Epistle to Diognetus*.
- WALTER C. SMITH**
Scottish journalist. First press officer of the B.B.C. 'W.C.S.' of the *Methodist Recorder*
- C. RYDER SMITH**
B.A., D.D.
Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.

r
y
s

d
r
t

e
f
h

y
n
t

d
d
r
l
e
t

o
,

d
-

d
e.
n

f
y

at
-
d
y.

e,
nt
or
e,

of

y,
nt

-
L.
e.
n.